DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 185 206 UD 020 488

AUTHOR Anwar, Muhammad
TITLE Who Tunes in to What? A Report on Ethnic Minority Broadcasting.
INSTITUTION Commission for Racial Equality, London (England).
PUB DATE May 78
NOTE 106p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Acculturation; Foreign Countries; *Mass Media; *Minority Groups; Popular Culture; *Programing (Broadcast); *Radio; Television Research; *Television Viewing
IDENTIFIERS *Asians; *England (Leicester)

ABSTRACT

This study was undertaken to determine how the press and broadcasting media report issues pertaining to ethnic minorities and race relations, and the extent to which ethnic minorities are given the opportunity to use these channels for information, entertainment, and cultural satisfaction. A sample of 1,192 Asians living in the Leicester City District area was interviewed concerning radio listening and television viewing patterns. Results are reported by specific programs, and by sex and demographic characteristics of the listeners/viewers. Specific needs of Asians living in England are identified, and the role the media can play in meeting these needs is discussed. Sweden's efforts in providing special programs for ethnic minority groups are compared to those in England. Finally, recommendations are made for improving broadcasting for ethnic minorities. Appendices include tables, descriptions of Asian language programs, selections from "Report of the Committee on the Future of Broadcasting" (London, 1977), and the interview schedule used in the study. (RLV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED185206

WHO TUNES IN TO WHAT?

A Report on Ethnic Minority Broadcasting

Muhammad Anwar

Commission for Racial Equality

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Lionel Morrison
Commission for Racial Equality
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

UD 020 488

Published by
Commission for Racial Equality
Elliot House
10-12 Allington Street
London SW1E 5EH

© Commission for Racial Equality

First edition:
May 1978

ISBN 0 902355 76 7

Printed by
Dual Developments Ltd., London.

Foreword

The Commission for Racial Equality was set up under the Race Relations Act, 1976 to carry out the following duties:

(a) to work towards the elimination of discrimination;

(b) to promote equality of opportunity, and good relations, between persons of different racial groups generally; and

(c) to keep under review the working of this Act and, when they are so required by the Secretary of State or otherwise think it necessary, draw up and submit to the Secretary of State proposals for amending it.

This is clearly a wide brief which encompasses every aspect of the life of the community; and broadcasting is an extremely important medium of mass communication which reaches into the home and therefore has a responsibility to contribute towards the achievement of equality of opportunity.

The research project reported in this booklet is the first to be conducted by the Commission into the audience participation of ethnic minority communities in this country and deserves to be widely read by those who directly determine policy in this area, by members of the various Advisory Councils and Committees within the field of broadcasting and, indeed, by those who may be otherwise disposed to think of themselves as "mere listeners"; for it stresses that the task of achieving equality of opportunity is one which should involve the energies of everyone in the community, policy-maker, adviser, administrator, broadcaster and listener alike.

Peter Tucker
Chief Executive

Preface and Acknowledgements

Under the Race Relations Act, 1976, the Commission for Racial Equality is empowered to undertake research itself and to assist others to undertake such research as can contribute to the elimination of racial discrimination and the achievement of equality of opportunity in the community. It was in this spirit of partnership that the research project reported in this booklet was undertaken in conjunction with the British Broadcasting Corporation.

Understandably, therefore, the project dealt with BBC Radio and Television programmes which are directed at the Asian community in the country as a whole, even though the fieldwork was undertaken in the Leicester editorial area. It does not deal with programmes which are broadcast by the Independent Broadcasting Authority.

Nevertheless, all research projects undertaken by the Research Department of this Commission are intended to:

(1) assist policy-makers and others to pursue equal opportunity policies in their own organisations and areas of activity and

(2) be of 'strategic value' in the sense that their results should be applicable to related organisations and areas of activity far beyond those which were covered in the initial fieldwork.

Accordingly, though programmes developed by the Independent Broadcasting Authority were not included in this research project, nevertheless our results should be applicable to them to the extent that these programmes are directed at ethnic minority communities. Our recommendations therefore embrace this wider area of ethnic minority broadcasting on both Radio and Television. For the same reason, they should be taken into account in the preparation of the White Paper on Broadcasting and subsequent legislation.

Throughout the course of conducting this research project, we were assisted by several individuals who freely gave us some of their time. It is invidious to mention names; nevertheless, we are grateful to John Saunders of the Programme Services Unit of the BBC, Denis Lambert of the Audience Research Department of the BBC, the Manager of Radio Leicester, Owen Bentley, the staff of the Asian Programmes Unit of the Corporation and members of the Asian Programmes Advisory Committee

and Barrie Brazier of the Leicester Community Relations Council. Their efforts enabled us to produce this report though they are not in any way responsible for what it says. Similarly, this study would not have been completed were it not for the co-operation of the 1,192 Asian respondents who took time off their various pursuits to participate in the interviews. We are also grateful to them for their help and to the Opinion Research Centre who assisted with the execution of the fieldwork for this project. Dr. Muhammad Anwar was the officer responsible for coordinating the various phases of the project and for the preparation of this report.

Dr Crispin Cross
Principal, Research Department
Legal and General Services Division

List of Tables

Table		Page No.
1	National radio programmes for migrants, 1975	10
2	Frequency of listening to radio each week by language spoken at home, fluency in English and age	16
3	Time spent listening to radio	17
4	Stations listened most to	18
5	Listening patterns of selected groups of Asians	19
6	Duplication of channels among Asians	20
7	Listening patterns by programmes	21
8	Selected demographic groups by four favourite programmes	22
9	Comments about "Milan"	23
10	Comments about the "Six O'Clock Show"	25
11	Comments on "Nai Zindagi Naya Jeevan" by fluency in English	29
12	Criticisms of "Nai Zindagi Naya Jeevan"	30
13	Comments on the timing of "Nai Zindagi Naya Jeevan"	31
14	Possible subjects to be included in "Nai Zindagi Naya Jeevan"	32
15	Reasons why finding jobs is a problem for Asians	35
16	Awareness of benefits and services	37
17	Those who do not know how to go about getting benefits and using services	39
18	Discrimination in Housing — Awareness of procedure to be adopted	40
19	Discrimination in Employment — Awareness of procedure to be adopted	41
20	Discrimination in other areas — Awareness of procedure to be adopted	42
21	Musical content of Asian programmes	45
22	Suggestions for inclusion in Asian radio programmes — Music	46
23	Opinions on future programme content	49

Contents

		Page No.
Foreword		
Preface and Acknowledgements		
List of Tables		
Chapter One	**Introduction: The Background**	9
	Comparison of Listening Habits in Germany and Sweden	11
	Methodology	13
	Area Profile	13
	Note on Terms	14
Chapter Two	**Radio Listening Patterns**	15
	Listening Patterns	15
	Radio Programmes for Asians	19
	"Milan"	22
	The "Six O'Clock Show"	24
	Other Programmes	25
Chapter Three	**Patterns of Television Viewing**	27
	Television Viewing	27
	Favourite Programmes	27
	"Nai Zindagi Naya Jeevan" (New Life)	28
	Comments on "Nai Zindagi Naya Jeevan"	30
Chapter Four	**Issues Identified in the Survey**	34
	Problems Experienced	34
	Difficulty in Finding Jobs	34
	Language and Religious Teaching in Schools	35
	Language and Communication with White People	36
	Sources of Advice	37
	Knowledge and Awareness of Services and Welfare Benefits	37
	Racial Discrimination	40
Chapter Five	**General Attitudes to Asian Programmes on Radio and TV**	44
	Music	44

	Religion and Culture	45
	Language Teaching for Adults	46
	Young People	47
	Information	47
	Community Relations	48
	Most important subject which should be included on Radio/TV Programmes	48
Chapter Six	**Conclusions**	51
Chapter Seven	**Recommendations**	56
	Notes and References	59

Appendices

1.	Sample Characteristics	61
2.	Ethnic Minority Programmes on PBC Local Radio	63
3.	Contents (Random) of Asian Programmes on BBC Radio Leicester and BBC Television During the Fieldwork Phase	65
4.	Relevant Paragraphs from the Annan Committee Report	68
5.	Ethnic Minority Broadcasting Interview Schedule	79

Chapter One: Introduction

The Background

The institutions of the mass media e.g. newspapers, radio, television, constitute a crucial part of the means of communication in modern society. They provide information and entertainment and act as a catalyst in the field of culture and education. Accordingly, it is often suggested that the central task of the mass media is to stabilise existing power relations because they are owned by a few powerful people. Lazersfeld and Merton put this view as follows: "Since the mass media are supported by great business concerns geared into the current social and economic system, the media contributes to the maintenance of that system"[1]. If this is so, does it mean that ethnic minorities who hold no power in this connection are denied access to the mass media? To what extent do the mass media reflect their needs? Part of the object of the study reported here was to provide answers to these and related questions.

However, such control does not mean that the institutions of the mass media do not have a role to play in bringing about social change.[2] On the contrary, they have a very crucial role to play in the process of social change by disseminating information. This information can be presented in such a way as to create a positive or a negative reaction on the part of the population as a whole. This is especially important in multi-ethnic societies where the mass media hold a key role in educating both the minority and the majority population; it could also manipulate and, indeed, generate conflict between ethnic minorities and the indigenous population and in this way either encourage the integration of ethnic minorities into society or force them to isolate themselves. Good race relations and equality of opportunity in Britain depend on creating understanding among different racial groups. The institutions of the mass media are aptly placed to contribute to the achievement of this kind of understanding.

In this respect, there are two aspects of the relationship between ethnic minorities and the mass media which should be borne in mind throughout this report. The first concerns the way ethnic minorities are projected by the institutions of the mass media and the second concerns the extent to which these minorities are given the opportunity of using

the mass media to obtain information about social institutions in the host country in order to assist their members to adjust to their new environment especially those who do not understand the *lingua franca* in that country. To be sure, these two aspects are intimately connected in reality; nevertheless, they can be separated for the purpose of analysing the data which was obtained in the survey which is reported here.

We believe that the way the press, radio and television report matters concerning ethnic minorities is important for the future of race relations generally. This was the theme of the weight of the evidence submitted to the Annan Committee on Broadcasting in 1975.[3] In this connection, some research has been conducted into the way non-whites are projected on British television[4] but no research has been undertaken to determine the extent to which ethnic minority programmes are 'consumed' by members of various ethnic minority communities.

The 20 local radio stations of the BBC product 25 special programmes for Asians and West Indians; in terms of programme hours, this amounts to 1.7% of the total local radio output of 85,000 hours.* However, it is instructive to see these programmes in their true perspective by comparison with similar programmes which are produced and broadcast by other Western European countries. This comparison is presented in Table 1.

TABLE 1: National Radio Programmes for Migrants, 1975

Country	*Minutes/Month*	*% of Total Output*
Austria	40	0.3
Belgium	1480	9.4
W. Germany	7650	48.2
France	1440	9.1
Luxembourg	600	3.8
Netherlands	600	3.8
Sweden	2680	17.0
Switzerland*	1212	7.6
Britain*	120	0.8

*Local and regional programmes are not included in these figures.

Source: Taisto Hujanen, *Immigrant Broadcasting and Migration Control in Western Europe*, University of Tampere, 1976, p.46.

This shows the output of special programmes on national radio for

*This is 73% of the BBC's annual domestic output. Fourteen of the 20 BBC local radio stations transmit special programmes for ethnic minorities.

ethnic minorities in Britain in 1975 and that Britain comes somewhere near the bottom of the league table in this respect. Though comparable information for local and regional radio is not available, nevertheless these figures provide a general indication of the relatively low performance of this country in this area of activity compared to others in Europe.

But the numerical representation of special ethnic minority programmes on radio is less significant than their sociological significance in general for immigrant communities which are here to stay. In this regard, the question is often asked: why have special ethnic minority programmes at all? The simple answer is this: if we recognise the spirit of cultural pluralism which is central to the notion of integration then ethnic minorities should have equal access to the media and therefore to programmes which provide information on their cultural background in an atmosphere of tolerance.[6] Further, their relative newness to this society and the language difficulties which they experience prevent them from using the mainstream media to learn about the society in which they are living. They therefore have to rely on special programmes in languages which they can understand. The majority of migrants in Britain, as in other countries, come from traditional rural societies to modern industrial ones and therefore have to undergo a process of resocialisation. In this situation the media has an important role to play in helping such migrants to integrate themselves into society. Ethnic minority programmes in their own languages therefore have a crucial role to play in making not only the adjustment of these migrants easier than it would otherwise be, but also in helping them to feel that they are now a part of British society and can hold on to their cultural values without any fear or threat.

What do we mean by integration? According to the much used definition of integration, put forward by Roy Jenkins, it is "not a flattening process of assimilation but ... of equal opportunity accompanied by cultural diversity, in an atmosphere of mutual tolerance."[7] Integration in this sense rather than enforced assimilation is one of the underlying objectives of the Race Relations Act 1976.

Comparison of Listening Habits in Germany and Sweden

What proportions of ethnic minority listeners do special programmes attract in other countries? In West Germany, 50% of migrants listen daily to the special programmes on the ARD network and 75% do so more than once a week.[8] An average of 43-45% listen to special programmes in their mother tongue on other channels more than once a week and an average of 85-90% do so occasionally.[9] These are high rates of consumption which are seldom achieved by mainstream domestic

radio programmes.

A survey in Sweden revealed that a majority of Finnish immigrants (70%) listen to special radio programmes and watch TV programmes in Finnish. Another survey in Sweden showed that all Greek and Yugoslav households were familiar with the programme "Invandrardags" on TV and 90% reported watching nearly every programme.[10] Further, 9 out of 10 households knew about T-V.1's weekly Childrens Stories in Greek, Serbo-Croat and Turkish. This survey also indicated that most families with young children watch these programmes and parents tended to do so in the company of their children. Families with language handicaps were most likely to watch these programmes.[11]

What is the position in Britain? Since no comparable information was available in Britain, the Community Relations Commission, in conjunction with the BBC, decided to undertake a research project in 1977 to establish the extent to which existing ethnic minority programmes are consumed by Asians as well as to explore the general attitudes of these communities towards the content of such programmes. This was later taken over by the newly-formed Commission for Racial Equality.

The origin of special programmes for ethnic minorities goes back to July 1965 when the BBC convened two conferences for representatives of the Asian and West Indian communities to find out "what special programmes, if any, their communities wanted and what other suggestions or criticisms they might wish to make about broadcasting and race relations". At the first conference, Indian and Pakistani representatives expressed a strong desire for special programmes for Asians and the BBC agreed to provide these. To this end, the Immigrant Programmes Unit, now known as the Asian Programmes Unit, was set up. It transmitted its first programme on television in October 1965.

At the second conference, West Indians indicated that they did not want to have special programmes exclusively for their community and expressed the fear that such special programmes could leave the impression that West Indians are separate from the rest of the community — an impression which they were anxious to dispel. Accordingly, they felt that the BBC can best secure their interest by presenting them as members of the community in their programmes, and by employing them, not only "behind the scene", but also on the screen and in front of the microphone.

As a result of these conferences, the BBC set up an Asian Programmes Advisory Committee in 1966 to advise on the production of TV and Radio programmes for the Asian Community. Some four or five years later, the West Indian community, conscious of the need

to create an awareness of its identity in the face of discrimination by the majority population, changed its original attitude and demanded its own programmes.

One of the main arguments for special programmes for ethnic minorities was that the British media tend to reflect what is essentially a "white" point of view. "Black news is reported from a white man's point of view and the real story is missed"[12] This raised the question as to whether this situation can be fundamentally changed if ethnic minorities were given access to the media. Has it changed? What kind of access do ethnic minorities have to the media of radio and television? In this way, these questions helped to structure the project with specific reference to BBC radio and TV programmes.

Methodology

The study was undertaken in the Leicester City District area. The whole area was divided into five parts and random routes were prepared within each part. Asian interviewers who had been thoroughly trained were instructed to call at every fourth house and to list all Asians aged 12 or above living within the household. A sample of 1,192 was then drawn from this list using tables of random numbers and interviewed. All the interviews were conducted between 26 May—9 July 1977 and dealt only with BBC radio and television programmes.

The interview schedule was translated into Bengali, Hindi, Gujarati, Punjabi and Urdu. All the interviewers were fluent in English but it was left to their discretion to determine whether an individual interview was carried out in English or in one of these Asian languages. However, where the interviewer felt that a respondent could fully comprehend the questions only in one of these languages, he was instructed to conduct the interview in that language throughout. The fieldwork was undertaken and co-ordinated by the Opinion Research Centre.

Area Profile

The city of Leicester has a long history of immigration. From the beginning of this century, immigrants to this city have included East Europeans, Jews and more recently New Commonwealth citizens i.e. mainly Asians and West Indians. Large numbers of East African Asians moved into Leicester during the sixties.

At the time of the expulsion of Asians from Uganda in 1972, many went to live with their friends and relatives who already lived there. Thus "chain migration" played a part in increasing the number of Asians in that city. Altogether, there are over 40,000 Asians in Leicester, three-fourths of whom speak Gujarati. Further, the city contains higher pro-

portions of Asian professionals than any other British city in which Asians have settled (except the Greater London area); similarly, because of the structure of its industry (i.e. hosiery, factories, wholesale and retail trades) it contains large numbers of Asian entrepreneurs. A recent survey showed that there are as many as 600 shops owned and run by Asians in that city.

The high proportion of Asian professionals and Asian-owned businesses in the city suggests that many Asians in Leicester are educated and therefore face fewer language difficulties. Therefore, our Asian sample is not typical of other areas of Asian settlement in the country. It is against this background that the findings reported in the following chapters should be seen.

Note on Terms

We are aware that such terms as "whites", "blacks", "ethnic minorities" etc. may be misleading, confusing or inaccurate as a description of all those who were involved in the study. Nevertheless, we felt it appropriate to use these terms in our report with the meanings which are usually attached to them. For the same reason, we refer to all our respondents as "Asians" irrespective of their countries of origin except where the analysis under discussion requires us to specify them as Pakistanis, Indians, Bangladeshis or East African Asians.

Social Class categories were derived from the occupation of the head of the household. For the purpose of analysis, these are described as ABC1, C2 and DE where

ABC1	corresponds to Managerial/Supervisory/White Collar Workers
C2	corresponds to Skilled manual workers
DE	to Semi and unskilled manual workers/those on pensions and other forms of social security payments

Chapter Two: Radio Listening Patterns

All immigrant groups face adjustment problems in their country of settlement. These problems tend to be more acute where the immigrants come from cultural backgrounds which are different from that of the host country and do not speak the common language. These problems therefore affect more Asians in Britain than other minority groups. Although, Asians in Leicester are relatively more educated than Asian communities in other cities and are used to British institutions because of their experience in East Africa, they are still relatively new settlers in this country.

In this and the following chapters we examine how far ethnic minority programmes are playing the dual role of (a) providing information in general and (b) satisfying the specific cultural needs of Asians. Before we discuss these details, however, it is important to analyse the listening patterns of Asians with regard to ethnic minority programmes. We would then be in a better position to analyse their knowledge, practice and attitudes to these programmes.

Listening Patterns

Over half the sample of 1,192 claimed to listen to radio almost every day and a further 27% listen less frequently. Only 20% claimed that they never listen to radio. As is shown in Table 2, those who listen to radio frequently are more likely to be those who are fluent in English and are in the 15-29 years age group. Those who never listen tend to be those who are not fluent in English and are in the 50 years and over age bracket.

All those (i.e. 80%) who claimed to listen to radio were then asked a number of questions about their listening habits. With regard to the amount of time spent listening to radio, two significant factors emerged based on sex and fluency in English: females and those who do not speak English listen less often than the others. The majority of those who listen

TABLE 2. Frequency of Listening to Radio Each Week* by Language Spoken at Home, Fluency in English, and Age

	All	*Language spoken at home***				*Fluency in** *English*			*Age*				
		English	*Gujarati*	*Punjabi*	*Other*	*Good*	*Poor*	*None*	*12/14*	*15/19*	*20/29*	*30/49*	*50+*
Base:	1192	85	893	177	76	593	415	129	67	181	374	436	134
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Nearly every day	53	62	54	49	39	60	47	36	51	61	61	48	36
3/5 days a week	14	19	13	20	18	12	13	14	10	14	16	13	14
Less than 3 days a week	13	8	12	19	14	12	13	12	13	13	8	16	15
Never listen	20	11	21	12	29	16	27	38	26	12	15	23	35

* Figures in this table relate to both English and Asian language programmes.

** This and subsequent tables where fluency in English has been used as a classificatory variable exclude 55 respondents whose fluency in English could not have been assessed by the interviewers.

*** There were some respondents who claim to use two languages at home with equal frequency.

at all do so for less than 10 hours during weekdays and for less than three hours during weekends. Table 3 below presents the frequencies.

TABLE 3: Time Spent Listening to Radio

		Sex		*Fluency in English*		
	All	*Male*	*Female*	*Good*	*Poor*	*None*
Base: All ever listening:	953	520	433	501	324	80
WEEKDAYS	%	%	%	%	%	%
3 hours or less	18	21	14	20	17	19
3 - 5 hours	43	38	49	37	48	54
5 -10 hours	22	25	19	25	19	19
10-15 hours	8	9	7	9	7	1
15-20 hours	2	2	2	2	2	1
20-25 hours	1	1	1	1	—	—
30-40 hours	1	1	1	2	*	1
40 hours +	1	1	1	1	1	1
Can't say/no answer	4	2	6	3	6	4
WEEKENDS						
3 hours or less	77	76	79	75	79	81
3 - 5 hours	10	12	8	12	8	5
5 -10 hours	5	5	4	6	4	4
10-15 hours	1	1	1	1	*	—
15-20 hours	*	*	*	*	*	—
20-25 hours	*	*	*	—	*	—
Don't know/Can't say	7	6	8	6	9	10

This shows that almost half of those who listen at all do so for less than five hours per week, 27% for 6-10 hours and 12% for 11-15 hours. We also see from Table 3 that those whose English is poor or non-existent spend fewer hours listening to radio than the others. If we exclude the 12-14 age group, younger people spend more time listening to radio than older people. Men are also marginally more likely to spend more time listening to radio than women. This is obviously related to the fact that more Asian women are less fluent in English than Asian men.[13]

As to which station they listened to, 83% mentioned Radio Leicester as the station they listened most to. The only other station mentioned by more than 10% of listeners was BBC Radio 1 (32%) and a few respondents mentioned more than one station. The responses are presented in Table 4 below.

TABLE 4*: Stations Listened Most to

Base: All listeners 953

	(a) Station Listened most to	*(b) Station sometimes listened to (unprompted)*	*(c) Station ever listened to (prompted)*
	%	%	%
BBC Radio 1	32	43	52
BBC Radio 2	7	14	25
BBC Radio 3	1	4	11
BBC Radio 4	6	12	20
BBC Radio Leicester	83	93	96
BBC Radio Birmingham	5	16	29
BBC Radio Derby	1	5	15
BBC Radio Nottingham	2	8	19
BRMB	*	*	6
Radio Trent	1	2	7
Other	4	16	26

Note: Column (b) accumulated with (a)
Column (c) accumulated with (a) + (b)

*As response categories are not exclusive, frequencies add up to more than 100% in this and subsequent tables.

What then are the demographic characteristics of those who listen to at least two stations: BBC Leicester and BBC Radio 1? The results show that Radio Leicester is less popular among British-born young Asians, those belonging to the middle class and those who are fluent in English; these groups tend to listen to BBC 1. For details see Table 5.

The high penetration of Radio Leicester into the Asian Community can also be demonstrated by an analysis of all those who claimed to listen "most" to Radio Leicester and BBC1. It is clear that 93% of those who listen to BBC Radio 1 also listen to Radio Leicester as is shown in Table 6.

On the other hand, of those who listen "most" to only Radio Leicester, 47% listen to BBC Radio 1. This includes an overwhelming majority of those whose English is non-existent and are unable to follow BBC Radio 1 and other radio stations transmitting in English only. It is

TABLE 5: Listening Patterns of Selected Groups of Asians

Base: All Listeners 953

		Nos	*Radio Leicester* %	*Radio 1* %
Residence in UK	Since birth	22	59	55
	10+ years	300	82	29
	5 - 9 years	363	84	36
	Under 5 years	268	85	29
Age	12-14	50	76	54
	15-19	159	71	59
	20-29	319	86	35
	30-49	337	88	20
	50+	88	78	11
Fluency	Good	501	78	46
	Poor	324	87	18
	None	80	88	9
Language	English	76	63	62
	Gujarati	700	84	34
	Punjabi	155	86	18
	Other	55	87	36
Class	ABC1	158	71	37
	C2	317	83	37
	DE	478	87	28

also important to note, that other stations which appear in the table such as Birmingham, Derby, Nottingham are listened to mainly because, like Radio Leicester, these transmit special programmes for Asians. This also applies, to some extent, to BBC Radio 4 which transmits "Apna Hi Ghar Samajhiye" ("Make Yourself At Home") for Asians on Sunday mornings.

Radio Programmes for Asians

There are two special programmes for Asians on Radio Leicester. These are "Milan" and the "Six O'clock Show".

"Milan" is a long established programme for Asians in Hindi/Urdu transmitted on Tuesdays. It presents information of all kinds to help the Asian community understand the facilities which are available to them. It also includes records, live bands, local news, children's stories and, at

TABLE 6: Duplication of Channels Among Asians

	All Listeners	*Those listening most to Radio Leicester*	*Radio 1*
Base:	953	790	305
Sometimes Listened to (prompted)	%	%	%
Radio 1	52	47	100
Radio 2	25	24	40
Radio 3	11	11	15
Radio 4	20	19	25
Radio Leicester	96	100	93
Radio Birmingham	29	31	24
Radio Derby	15	16	16
Radio Nottingham	19	21	20
BRMB	6	6	7
Radio Trent	7	7	1?
Other	16	15	28

present, a series of "Take Away English" aimed at increasing fluency in English.

The "Six O'clock Show" (Now called the "Six 30 Show") is a programme in English aimed at ethnic minorities (mainly Asians). It was first broadcast in October 1976 and is transmitted on four days a week (Mondays, Wednesdays, Thursdays and Fridays). It includes local news, basic information about this society, and Asian music. It also involves local people through special phone-in programmes. The purpose of the programme, according to the manager of Radio Leicester, is "to provide the initial incentive for ethnic minorities to listen to the station. The long term aim, however, is to encourage listening to the output generally and to encourage full participation in access programmes across the broadcasting day". We shall see later whether these objectives are being achieved among Asians in the area. (See Appendix III for a random selection of programme content for this programme).

The overwhelming majority of those who listen to Radio Leicester, listen to special programmes for Asians only. Almost two-thirds of those who listen regularly, listen to "Milan" and to the "Six O'clock Show" and in both cases another 25% listen occasionally. This is followed by "Apna Hi Ghar Samajhiye" another Asian programme, listened to by 30% on both BBC Radio 4 and BBC Birmingham channels but the

weight of listening is on Radio 4 rather than on Radio Birmingham. The simple explanation for this is (i) that the Radio 4 programme is transmitted on Sunday mornings and (ii) that the reception of this programme in the Leicester area is better than that of Radio Birmingham. The important point still remains that Asians tend to listen to their own special programmes more than to other programmes. Indeed, "Good Morning Leicester" is listened to regularly only by 10% though the reasons for this are only partly concerned with the fact that it is broadcast in English.

TABLE 7: Listening Patterns by Programmes

Base: All who listen to Radio: 953	*listen regularly* %	*listen occasionally* %	*do not listen* %
Six O'clock Show	66	25	9
Milan	62	25	13
Apna Hi Ghar Samajhiye (BBC 4)	8	13	78
Apna Hi Ghar Samajhiye* (Birmingham)	2	7	91
Good Morning Leicester	10	11	79
Nawrang (Nottingham)	4	10	86
Sangam (Derby)	3	9	88
East & West (Birmingham)	1	8	91
Geet (BRMB)	1	3	96
Gharana (Birmingham)	1	4	95
Three till Ten (Leicester)	1	3	96
Cross Talk (Leicester)	1	4	95
Right up your Street (Leicester)	1	3	96

*This is a repeat transmission.

The figures in Table 8 show that Asian programmes are relatively less popular among: (a) those who are still going to school, (b) those who have lived in Britain since their birth and (c) those who belong to the middle classes.

TABLE 8: Selected Demographic Groups by Four Favourite Programmes

		Milan		*6 O'clock Show*		*Apna Hi Ghar Samajhiye*		*Good Morning Leicester*	
	Base	*Reg.*	*Occ.*	*Reg.*	*Occ.*	*Reg.*	*Occ.*	*Reg.*	*Occ.*
All	953	*62%*	*25%*	*66%*	*25%*	*9%*	*17%*	*10%*	*11%*
Residence in UK									
Since birth	22	23	36	41	32	—	5	—	6
10 year +	300	62	26	64	25	13	23	10	11
5 - 9 years	363	60	25	65	26	8	16	10	11
Under 5 years	268	66	23	71	23	8	10	10	11
Age									
12-14	50	44	30	52	34	—	2	10	10
15-19	159	57	26	62	29	3	9	6	13
20-29	319	66	24	69	24	7	20	11	14
30-49	337	63	25	67	23	13	19	11	9
50 +	88	60	25	70	29	20	16	7	8
Fluency in English									
Good	501	57	27	63	26	8	17	13	14
Poor	324	65	25	66	26	1	19	6	10
None	80	65	24	71	24	14	10	5	4
Language									
English	76	46	28	49	30	12	11	14	16
Gujarati	700	64	24	68	24	9	16	10	11
Punjabi	155	64	26	65	27	12	25	8	12
Radio Listening									
Heavy	251	69	20	71	20	14	19	21	16
Medium	492	71	19	78	18	8	18	6	12
Light	197	29	47	29	50	7	9	7	5

It is also interesting that while heavy and medium listeners, listen to all programmes, they figure significantly in the audience for "Milan" and the "Six O'clock Show".

"Milan"

The analysis of audience reaction or attitudes to a particular programme can indicate not only how much a programme is liked but what the audience for whom it was intended think about it. This kind of information is valuable for future programme planning since it can indicate such programme content as will be advantageous or even essential for the maximum participation of ethnic minorities in society.

Some of these may be specific to situations but others may be of a general nature.

In this connection a substantial majority of listeners made generally favourable comments about the "Milan" programme. Over half of them thought that it was "good/interesting" and almost one-third liked the songs. But only 16% felt that they obtained useful information about the local community through this programme.

The major criticism of this programme was that there was "too much chat/talk" (22%) followed by 16% who would have liked a greater Hindi content in it and 9% who would have liked its quality improved. However, those who are least fluent in English were least likely to be critical of the programme. The explanation for this is that those who are least fluent in English do not have the ability to follow those programmes which are transmitted in English and therefore tend to be content with whatever is put out in "Milan".

As far as the subjects covered in "Milan" are concerned, few specific criticisms were advanced. What is more interesting from the point of view of future programme planning is what the respondents felt were omitted from "Milan" as well as the subjects they would most like to be included in it. This is presented in Tables 9 and 23 below.

TABLE 9: Comments About "Milan"

	All	*Fluency in English*		
	Listeners	*Good*	*Poor*	*None*
Base:	804	408	281	90
	%	%	%	%
(Over 5%)				
Content good/interesting	51	50	51	57
Like the songs	30	28	31	36
Interesting/useful information for Community	16	18	13	11
Like News cover	9	7	9	17
In right language	7	6	7	14
Well made/good quality	7	8	7	6
Entertaining/amusing	7	8	7	7
Too much chat/talking	22	24	21	10
Should have more/be in Hindi	11	12	10	10
Poor quality/not professional	9	13	6	1
Language wrong/don't understand	5	5	4	4

Six out of ten Asian listeners could not think of any subject currently not covered by "Milan" which should be covered; the remaining 40% mentioned more than one subject; 20% would like more Asian classical music and 11% would like more British news. On the other hand, older respondents would like more news from the Sub-continent, more local news and more classical music. Similarly, men rather than women, and those in the socio-economic group DE would also like more news from the Sub-continent.

We also wanted to find out what Asians thought was the purpose of "Milan". More than two-thirds saw it as entertaining and 25% saw it as being educational and informative. In this regard, there are differences between groups: for instance, older people find it more informative while those who are least fluent in English, see it as being entertaining.

As far as the timing of "Milan" is concerned our evidence suggests that for almost nine out of ten listeners, the timing is suitable and convenient. However, 15% felt that it was on "for too short a time".

What about those who did not listen to "Milan"? It will be recalled that only 76 (i.e. 13%) respondents who listened to radio, did not listen to "Milan". Half of these had never heard of the programme; 18% did not listen because it was broadcast while they were either busy or at work. A further 14% did not listen because they did not like the programme.

On the whole, our evidence suggests that the "Milan" programme is popular with the Asian community in Leicester even though it is transmitted only once a week while the "Six O'clock Show" is transmitted four times a week. On the other hand, "Milan" is a much older and has had a much long time to build up its audience than the "Six O'clock Show". Any comparison of the popularity of these programmes should be made in the light of this fact.

The "Six O'clock Show"

The comments about this programme were similar to those which were expressed about "Milan". Table 10 presents these comments.

However, unlike the case with "Milan", 77% thought that the purpose of the "Six O'clock Show" was primarily concerned with entertainment and only 19% saw it as being principally concerned with transmitting useful information. The comments on the timing of this programme were also similar to those which were expressed about "Milan". Nine out of ten respondents found the time convenient. However, some 14% felt that it was on for "too short a time".

What about those who did not listen to the "Six O'clock Show"? Of the 60 (i.e. 9%) respondents who do not listen to this programme, 40%

TABLE 10: Comments About the "Six O'clock Show"

Base: All listening	843
	%
Contents good/interesting	56
Like the songs	39
Useful information	16
Entertaining/amusing	12
Well made/quality	9
News coverage liked	8
In right language	6
Too much talking	16
Should be in Hindi	12
Poor quality	7
Can't understand language	6
Don't like/too many songs	3

had never heard of it, 28%, for one reason or another, found its timing inconvenient for them and only 10% criticised the content or presentation of the programme and claimed not to like it.

On the whole the "Six O'clock Show" is listened to less regularly than "Milan" because the latter is transmitted only once a week while the former is transmitted four times a week.

Other Programmes

The relatively small number of listeners to other programmes, "Apna Hi Ghar Samajhiye" (209) and "Nawrang" (105), did not allow us to undertake sophisticated analysis of their responses. However, there seems to be a high level of dissatisfaction (44%) with the early time scheduling of "Apna Hi Ghar Samajhiye" on BBC Radio 4 as well as with its musical/cultural content.

Looking at the other programmes on Radio Leicester, we find that three quarters of the total sample did not listen to "Cross Talk" and only 8% of all radio listeners who did not listen to it were aware of its existence. 87% of these people were busy at work, at school or doing other things during its transmission time. 79% of the total sample did not listen to "Good Morning Leicester", and of these 77% claimed never to have heard of the programme. Of those who claimed never to have heard of the programme, 16% indicated that this was because its timing was inconvenient for them. Similarly, 96% never listen to "Right up Your Street"; of these only 8% claimed to be ignorant of its existence. A total of 96% of the sample never listen to "Three till Ten" and only 10% of

all such non-listeners were aware that the programme exists. The majority of such non-listeners found the transmission time to be inconvenient for them to listen.

Three further points are worth noting here, especially in relation to the two most popular ethnic minority programmes ("Milan" and the "Six O'clock Show"). Firstly, the 238 respondents who claimed never to listen to radio were asked whether there was a radio in their household. Of these, 58% said that there was one which they could have listened to had they wished to do so, while 42% did not have a radio. This means, in effect, that only 100 people could not listen to these programmes because they had no radio with which to do so.

Secondly, about 66% of all non-listeners claimed to have heard of the "Six O'clock Show" and 54% claimed to have heard of "Milan". Of all those who had heard about both programmes 62% and 60% respectively claimed that they had tried the programme at least once.

Thirdly, it will be recalled that 8 out of 10 listen to "Milan" and the "Six O'clock Show" programmes on Radio Leicester. However, 15% of these claimed that they have taken to listening to at least one other Radio Leicester programme since hearing "Milan" and the "Six O'clock Show". In view of the short time the "Six O'clock Show" has been on the air this is a significant development. Of those who listen to "Milan" and the "Six O'clock Show", 76% claimed to switch off their radio after listening and only 7% go on listening to whatever follows.

When we compare the average amount of radio listening by Asians (9 hours per week) with that of the general population in Leicester (9½ hours) we find that they (Asians) tend to listen only slightly less to the radio. Figures for the population at large were analysed by the BBC Department of Audience Research in their Daily Surveys. But it is clear from the evidence above that an overwhelming majority of Asians in Leicester listen to ethnic minority programmes while very few listen to other BBC Radio Leicester programmes. This means that the best means of reaching the Asian community is through the medium of special programmes in general and special programmes in Asian languages in particular. It is also clear that their knowledge of other programmes on local radio is limited and that special Asian programmes can be used to improve this knowledge.

The comments made by some listeners about the content of ethnic minority programmes are also worth noting, for they suggest ways in which the format of Asian language programmes could be improved.

Chapter Three: Patterns of Television Viewing

One of the requirements for good broadcasting in our society is diversity and with it, the possibility of choice. This was stressed in the Annan Committee report as follows: "our society's culture is now multi-racial and pluralist; that is to say, people adhere to different views of the nature and purpose of life and expect their own view to be expressed in some form or other. The structure of broadcasting should reflect this variety".[14] Television no doubt plays an important role in broadcasting especially since it has a more immediate impact in its combination of sound and vision. It is important therefore to discover how the public react to television programmes in a multi-cultural society and in particular how Asians react to special Asian programmes on BBC television.

Television Viewing

Almost all the Asians interviewed in Leicester watch television; only 4% claimed that they never do so. Of the total who watch, 80% claimed that they watch it every day. Indeed, as many as 74% of those who were classified as speaking no English claimed that they watch television nearly every day. Clearly, this group of respondents find it easier to follow programmes on TV than to listen to the radio. Overall, these figures suggest a high degree of penetration into the Asian community by television.

For how long do Asians watch television? A quarter of those who watch television claimed to do so for over 25 hours a week; a further 31% watch between 15 and 25 hours, 20% watch for between 10 and 15 hours and the remaining 23% watch for 10 hours or less each week. Younger respondents, particularly those in the 12-14 age group, watch more television than older ones. Nearly half of them watch television for over 25 hours a week. On the other hand, those whose English is poor watch television for fewer hours per week though they are likely to do so every day.

Favourite Programmes

When respondents were asked to indicate six of their favourite

programmes, "Crossroads" was mentioned by 19%, "Starsky and Hutch" by another 19%, "Six Million Dollar Man" or "Bionic Woman" by 20%, "Kojak" by 12% and "Nai Zindagi Naya Jeevan" by 11%.

Comedy series (e.g. "Morecambe and Wise", "The Two Ronnies", etc.) were mentioned by 18% as their favourite programmes. A similar number liked situation comedies such as "Are You Being Served", "Bless this House", "Love Thy Neighbour", etc. Drama series were preferred by 17% and 46% preferred films or plays.

The news was mentioned by 31% as one of their six favourites. It is worth noting that the news was liked by more men (41%) than women (18%). This has to do with the fact that more Asian men speak English than women. However, most Asians watch the news on television irrespective of their level of English language. They 'guess' at its content and help each other to interpret its meaning. Young Asians, who tend to be generally more fluent in English than their parents, act as interpreters. It is interesting also to note that 28% of men mentioned sports as one of their six favourite programmes as against only 7% of women.

What, however, were their reactions to the only television programme for Asians "Nai Zindagi Naya Jeevan"?

"Nai Zindagi Naya Jeevan" (New Life)

This programme was first broadcast in October 1965*. It goes out on Sunday mornings at 9.40 am (9.00 am at the time of the survey). It is a magazine type of programme and includes a weekly round-up of news, topical interviews, discussions on ethnic minority problems, and stories of the individual difficulties and successes of various persons among Asian communities in different parts of the country. Recently two new items were included in the programme in order to improve the programme's appeal, according to the producers. These are "Khial Apna Apna" (Viewpoint) and "Youth Forum". A random selection of the contents of this programme is presented in Appendix III to illustrate its format.

This programme was repeated on Wednesday mornings on BBC 2 during the time when our field work was conducted. Reference to the Wednesday transmission therefore, refers to the repeat transmission and not to the new programme — "Gharbar" — which took its place since October, 1977.

Of those who watch television, "Nai Zindagi Naya Jeevan" was mentioned by 11% as one of their six favourite programmes, and 67%

*Under its original title: "Apna Hi Ghar Samajhiye."

claimed that they watch it regularly. Only 2% had never heard of it; 25% had heard of it but did not watch it and the rest claimed to watch it only occasionally. Those whose knowledge of English is poor, are much more likely to watch this programme than others.

Almost all those who watched "Nai Zindagi Naya Jeevan" did so on BBC 1 on Sunday mornings. Only 7% claimed to have been equally likely to watch it on Sundays or Wednesdays, but only 4% claimed to watch it exclusively on BBC 2 on Wednesdays only. Nearly half (45%) of those who do not watch the programme at all, do not do so because they are still in bed when it is transmitted on Sundays.

As mentioned above, a new programme "Gharbar" replaced the repeat transmission of "Nai Zindagi Naya Jeevan" on Wednesdays since October, 1977. It is aimed at providing information for the Asian community about health and hygiene, money, marriage, education, the environment, other cultures and careers. It is, in fact, aimed at responding to the known special needs of Asian women and children. The BBC's Further Education Department also recently launched a 26-programme series called "Parosi" for Asian women who need help with their English language. However, we were unable to include these programmes in our investigation.

TABLE 11: Comments on "Nai Zindagi Naya Jeevan" by Fluency in English

	Total	*Fluency in English*		
		Excellent/ very good	*Not very good/poor*	*None at all*
Base: All who watch "Nai Zindagi Naya Jeevan"	879	403	335	108
	%	%	%	%
Interesting/ content good	44	37	49	55
Like news/cover news	16	16	16	18
Useful/interesting information	16	17	14	20
Like the songs	9	9	9	6
Well made/hign standard	6	7	6	3
In the right language	4	4	3	9
Enjoyable/amusing/ entertaining	4	6	3	2

Comments on "Nai Zindagi Naya Jeevan"

What attitudes did respondents exhibit towards this programme? Nearly half of those who watched the programme described it as "interesting/good content". Its news items were praised by 16% of our respondents and an equal number claimed to have obtained useful information from it. Further details of these responses are presented in Table 11.

On the other hand, considerable criticism of the programme was expressed. For instance, 30% claimed that there was too much talking in the programme and 15% said that it was badly made and that its presentation was not professional; 25% found it boring. Table 12 presents details of the criticisms which were made by more than 5% of

TABLE 12: Criticisms of "Nai Zindagi Naya Jeevan"

		Fluency in English		
	Total	*Good*	*Poor*	*None*
	879	403	335	108
	%	%	%	%
Base: All who watch "Nai Zindagi Naya Jeevan"				
Too much talking	30	33	28	21
Poor standard/not professional	15	20	11	6
Should be in Hindi	14	16	12	7
Don't like the songs	10	11	9	7
Wrong language/ can't understand	9	11	6	9
Boring/waste of time/rubbish	8	9	7	4
Should be in Gujarati	6	8	6	4
Too narrow range of topics	6	7	6	1
Should have news of Sub-continent	6	4	7	5
Want more songs	5	4	5	7
Wrong Asian language	5	6	4	5
Too short	5	4	6	6
Only for one particular cultural group	5	5	4	4

the respondents. Those who do not speak English were less likely to criticise it.

It is worth recalling that nearly half of those who do not watch the programme at all, do not do so because they are still in bed when it is transmitted. When asked what they thought about its timing, nearly half thought that it was convenient but 40% said that it was too early. 33% felt that the programme was not long enough (see Table 13). Those whose English is good were more critical of the timing of the transmission and of the length of the programme (i.e. 52% and 38% respectively). On the other hand, those who speak very little or no English and who were thus presumably most keen to watch it, were less critical about the timing than were those who speak English well and thus have a wider choice of television programmes to watch.

TABLE 13: Comments on the Timing of "Nai Zindagi Naya Jeevan"

		Fluency in English		
	Total	*Good*	*Poor*	*None*
Base:	879	403	335	108
Think that time of "Nai Zindagi Naya Jeevan" is:	%	%	%	%
Convenient/suitable	53	40	63	70
Too early	40	52	32	22
Too short/not long enough	34	38	31	23

The majority of respondents thought that the programme was educational. 56% thought it was educational while 28% thought that it was entertaining; 8% thought that it was both. This is in contrast with local radio programmes which were mainly perceived as entertainment by our respondents.

Respondents were then asked their views as to those subjects which they would like to see included in "Nai Zindagi Naya Jeevan". A third of them could not think of any subject which the programme should cover but does not already deal with. However, 20% of the viewers would like to see more Asian popular music included in the programme. Other topics which were suggested are presented in Table 14. These fall into three broad categories: those relating to Asian cultures, information and entertainment.

TABLE 14: Possible Subjects to be Included in "Nai Zindagi Naya Jeevan"

		Fluency in English		
	Total	*Excel/ V.G.*	*Not V.G./ Poor*	*None at all*
Base:	879	403	335	108
Can't think of anything/OK as it is	35	29	37	50
Asian popular music	22	24	24	9
Entertainment	22	26	20	16
Stories/plays	14	17	12	7
News from Sub-continent	14	15	14	10
More music (unspecified)	14	18	11	7
Asian films	12	13	13	8
Asian culture	8	9	8	6
Information for young Asians on:				
Asian culture	7	7	7	4
Asian classical music	7	8	5	7
National (British) news	5	6	4	5
Religion/ religious teaching	5	6	3	7
Religion for young Asians	5	5	4	6
Citizens rights/ advice on problems	5	6	4	1
Quizzes/competitions	5	8	4	—
Information on anti-discrimination laws	4	6	3	—
Asian language teaching	4	3	4	3
Local affairs/news	4	6	3	1
Local happenings/ events	4	5	4	2

In the light of the above, it is clear that "Nai Zindagi Naya Jeevan", the only Asian programme on television at the time when the survey was

conducted, is watched by a large number of Asians; many of these viewers also advanced some criticisms of the programme which should be noted by its producers and by senior staff at the BBC.

Similarly, the weight of evidence suggests that while younger Asians tend to be fluent in English, their knowledge of Hindi/Urdu (the language in which "Nai Zindagi Naya Jeevan" is transmitted) is not as good as that of their parents. Is there then a case for subtitling these programmes in English? In our view, such subtitling will also have the advantage of enabling all those who do not understand Urdu/Hindi and, indeed, indigenous people who would like to know more about Asian cultures, to follow the programme.[15] Integration is a two way process and the media in general, and television in particular, could play an important role in this context by enabling different groups to communicate with each other. The Asian Programmes Unit at the BBC already receives many letters from English people who enjoy the musical part of the programme and would like to know more about the rest of its content but cannot do so at the moment.

Chapter Four: Issues Identified in the Survey

The majority of the Asian population has been in Britain for only a relatively short time, though their settlement in this country has a long history. Accordingly, many still experience problems in adjusting to their new environment and are disadvantaged relative to the indigenous population. In this chapter we report some of the issues which our respondents identified as problems for them. We then go on to assess how far the media can play an important role in providing more information about these issues or, indeed, in reflecting them generally.

Problems Experienced

Respondents were asked what problems they and their families experience and how serious they felt these problems were. The problems they considered to be most serious are the difficulty of finding jobs and the absence of mother-tongue instruction in schools.

Difficulty in Finding Jobs

50% of our respondents said that this was a problem and 29% considered it a serious one. Indeed, 22% of those who held full or part time jobs at the time of the fieldwork thought that finding jobs in the area was a serious problem. Anxiety over this problem was greatest among young Asians (15-19 year olds) and among those who have British educational qualifications; 75% of young Asians thought that finding jobs was a problem and of these 42% thought that it was a serious one.

The main reasons why finding jobs is a problem are summarised in Table 15.

About 40% of those who said that finding a job was a problem attributed this to a generally high level of unemployment and specifically local unemployment. The second most common reason given by about 25% was that employers are racially prejudiced and practise discrimination. Among those who were classified as speaking no English at all, racial prejudice and discrimination was mentioned by only 6% and language difficulty by 22% as a cause of the employment problems faced by Asians. For those whose English was classified as excellent or very

TABLE 15*: Reasons Why Finding Jobs is a Problem for Asians

	Fluency in English				*Age Groups*				
	Total	*Good*	*Poor*	*None*	*12-14*	*15-19*	*20-29*	*30-49*	*50+*
Base: All thinking finding jobs a serious problem:	585	324	187	50	31	130	204	163	57
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
General shortage of work high unemployment/no jobs in this area/town	38	29	32	18	45	40	36	39	41
Racial prejudice/ discrimination	21	27	16	6	13	22	25	21	11
Only skilled/educated etc. get work	14	18	10	4	13	21	14	10	12
Language problems	10	9	10	22	13	10	9	9	18
No jobs of particular types available	6	5	7	8	3	3	7	7	5

*The percentages in each column add up to less than 100% because reasons which were mentioned by less than 5% of the sample were excluded from this table.

good, the position was reversed — racial discrimination being more often (27%) mentioned than language difficulty (9%). In particular, racial discrimination was mentioned as a reason more often by those who have achieved British educational qualifications probably because they are in a position to compare themselves with their white counterparts when it comes to getting jobs.

Language and Religious Teaching in Schools

Asian languages are not only a means of maintaining a link with the country of origin or communicating with parents who do not speak English, but also provide access to the religion and culture of the home. Therefore, Asians' concern about the lack of Asian language instruction in schools is understandable. For example, over 50% of our respondents thought that this was a problem faced by Asian families in Leicester.

Within the Asian community, Sikhs are more likely to think it a serious problem (over 40%) than other religious groups. The reason for this appears to be that other communities have started some language

classes in the area on a self-help basis while Sikhs, who are fewer in number in the area, have not been able to follow suit.

Over 50% of the older Asians (30+) were concerned about the lack of mother tongue instruction in schools. About 18% made the point that children cannot communicate with their parents because they do not understand their mother tongue. However, almost all of them would like such facilities to be made available for religio-cultural reasons. The EEC directive on mother tongue[16] was mentioned by some respondents as a policy area that requires further exploration especially in the light of evidence from other countries which suggest that learning a second language is easier where pupils have a thorough knowledge of, and ability to use, their mother tongue.

Over 30% of those we interviewed felt that getting enough religious teaching for young Asians was a problem in the area. They felt that young people should get more facilities for religious teaching and, in particular, classes should be held at school. It was felt that the absence of mother tongue and religious instruction contributes to the alienation of young Asians from their family and culture which, in turn results in family conflict.[17]

Language and Communication with White People

Most Asians enter Britain with many handicaps, the most important of which are their difficulties with the English language and their unfamiliarity with British institutions. 45% of those interviewed thought that their inability to speak English creates difficulties for them and for their families. Of these, 68% consider it a really serious problem. Furthermore, more women thought it was a serious problem for them than men, and older respondents (50+) were more likely to think it a serious problem than younger ones.

It was generally recognised that an inability to speak English causes problems at work or reduces the likelihood of obtaining work; it creates difficulties with shopping, dealing with school teachers and mixing with white people generally. This clearly has implications for good relations between Asians and indigenous people. 72% of those who speak no English were particularly concerned about their inability to communicate with white people. And once again women and older Asians (50+) were more likely to face this difficulty. 40% of the respondents who were unable to speak English, did not know of any facilities for adults who wish to learn English in their area. In this connection, programmes designed to provide adults with instruction in English have an important role to play.

Sources of Advice

Apart from language difficulties other difficulties mentioned by 40% of those interviewed concern their knowledge of established institutions and sources for advice. Some complained that there were no advice centres in their localities. Others suggested that notices and advertisements should also be in Asian languages for the benefit of those who experience language difficulties.

On education, 26% said that they did not know where to go for advice while 15% did not know anything about the education system. Lack of sufficient careers advice for young people and lack of information about training opportunities for young people was also mentioned by 34% of our respondents; nor did 54% know how trade unions operate; 30% did not know how the electoral system works.

Knowledge and Awareness of Services and Welfare Benefits

It is well known by those who work with the Asian community that many Asians do not know how to go about getting certain benefits. There are two obvious reasons for this: their language handicap and illiteracy. Further, the majority are not accustomed to any system of welfare benefits in their countries of origin.

TABLE 16: Awareness of Benefits and Services

	Would know	*Would not Know*	*Not sure*
Base: All sample: 1,192	%	%	%
Sickness benefit	74	23	3
Unemployment benefit	74	25	1
Family Income Supplement	58	38	4
Maternity benefit (for wife)	57	38	5
Free school meals	49	44	7
Old age pension	49	45	6
Council housing	49	45	6
Advice about taxation	47	47	6
Home improvement grants	46	49	5
Rent/rate rebates	43	51	6
Widows pension	41	54	5
Advice re. immigration regulations	32	59	9

Not surprisingly therefore, our analysis revealed a high level of ignorance about welfare benefits. While roughly three-quarters of our sample thought that they knew how to go about getting unemployment or sickness benefits, only one in three claimed to know how to go about getting advice about immigration regulations or widows' pensions. Table 16 presents the details of our analysis.

Similarly between 40-50% claimed to be ignorant about home improvement grants, taxation advice, council housing, old age pensions and free school meals. Just under 40% did not know how to go about getting maternity benefits or family income supplement while almost a quarter claimed they would not know how to go about getting unemployment or sickness benefits.

When we look at the demographic characteristics of those who are not knowledgeable about applying for benefits and welfare services, we find that on every single subject area those in the DE socio-economic group, and those who have been in England for less than 5 years are marginally more likely to be ignorant. In other words, such ignorance is only marginally dependent on the length of time which respondents have spent in this country. Table 17 presents the details.

It is also clear from the figures that those who are over 50 have even less of an idea about how to claim the various benefits and use the available services in the area.

As mentioned in the last section, those whose English is poor or virtually non-existent face, by far, the greatest difficulties in dealing with the welfare services. They constituted almost half of the sample (even in an area like Leicester). In this connection, it is disturbing to note that between 73% and 84% of those in this group claimed that they would not know how to go about getting benefits and other welfare services. Even in the case of unemployment and sickness benefits about which most of the other groups were reasonably well-informed, more than half of this group claimed not to know how to go about getting such benefits.

This evidence clearly suggests that the authorities responsible for publicising these benefits and services have still not been able to get through to Asians who, for their part, remain mainly unaware of welfare facilities. There is an urgent need to inform the Asian community much more widely about their welfare rights; in this regard, special attention should be paid to elderly Asians, recent arrivals and those who are less fluent in English. Such information needs to be presented in the appropriate Asian languages to overcome their language difficulties.

To be sure, there are members of the white population who are just as unaware of these facilities and how to make use of them. Nevertheless, Asians face special difficulties in obtaining information about these

TABLE 17: Those Who Do Not Know How to go About Getting Benefits and Using Services

	All	Under 5 year in Eng.	Fluency in English: Poor	Fluency in English: None	Age 50+	DE Social Class	Language mainly spoken at home*: Guja-rati	Punjabi	English	Others
Base: All respondents:	1192	364	415	129	134	609	893	177	85	76
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Advice about immigration regulations	59	66	65	84	66	63	60	58	41	61
Widows pensions	54	62	61	79	58	58	55	55	45	49
Rent or rate rebates	51	58	58	84	59	55	50	53	46	58
Home improvement scheme	49	57	54	84	68	54	50	47	34	47
Taxation	46	55	51	83	58	51	46	46	39	54
Council housing	45	48	53	78	60	48	44	50	41	45
Old Age pension	45	51	54	78	50	48	46	46	31	46
Free school meals	44	51	49	78	65	46	43	46	54	49
Maternity benefit	38	50	39	73	58	39	40	29	32	41
Family income supplement	38	47	42	73	52	40	38	38	38	39
Unemployment benefit	24	27	27	62	38	26	24	28	22	28
Sickness benefit	23	31	23	57	35	25	23	20	25	30

*Note: There were a few respondents who claimed to use two languages at home with equal frequency.

facilities, due to their newness, language difficulties and background culture. Surely, the media, in particular local radio, have a role to play in assisting them to become more aware of these facilities especially since large numbers of Asians consume the special programmes which are available at present.

Racial Discrimination

The survey was carried out during the change-over from the Race Relations Act 1968 to the Race Relations Act 1976. As a consequence, this was also the time when the two central bodies, the Community Relations Commission and the Race Relations Board, were being amalgamated to form the Commision for Racial Equality. It was therefore premature to ask our respondents specific questions about their knowledge of the new Act or of the powers of the new organisation which was going to be responsible for administering it. However, we were interested in exploring our respondents' general awareness of racial discrimination and how to go about seeking redress.

Just over half of the sample claimed that racial discrimination was not a problem for them. And those who are not fluent in English are much less likely to feel that discrimination is a problem.

TABLE 18: Discrimination in Housing — Awareness of Procedure to be Adopted

	All	*Sex*		*Class*			*Age**			
		Male	*Female*	*ABC1*	*C2*	*DE*	*15/19*	*20/29*	*30/49*	*50+*
Base:	1192	640	552	190	393	609	181	374	436	134
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Yes	30	39	20	41	37	23	33	33	33	18
No	62	53	73	48	58	69	57	61	61	74
Not sure	7	7	7	10	5	7	9	6	6	8

	Residence in UK			*Fluency in English*		
	Years 10+	*Years 5/9*	*Years 0/5*	*Good*	*Poor*	*None*
	383	445	364	593	415	129
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Yes	40	30	21	44	20	4
No	55	60	73	48	73	91
Not sure	4	10	6	8	7	5

*This table excludes those who are below 15 years of age.

41

The question then arose as to what a respondent can do if he thought he had been discriminated against because of his race, colour, nationality or ethnic origin. We found that more than two-thirds of our respondents were unsure about what they would do if they were discriminated against in their search for housing. These were mainly:

(i) those who had lived in Britain for less than five years;
(ii) those whose English is poor;
(iii) women rather than men; and
(iv) those in the DE socio-economic group who were less likely than those in the C2 socio-economic group, who in turn were less likely than ABC1s, to know what they would do when an act of discrimination took place.

Table 18 presents the details on the specific issue of discrimination in housing.

Similarly, Tables 19 and 20 present the details of answers relating to employment and other fields. The responses are similar to those concerned with housing except that the ignorance about the possibility of discrimination in other fields was even higher than in connection with housing and employment. This was summarised by one of our respondents who said "I did not know that discrimination could take place in any way other than in housing and employment."

TABLE 19: Discrimination in Employment — Awareness of Procedure to be Adopted

	All	*Sex*		*Class*			*Age*			
		Male	*Female*	*ABC1*	*C2*	*DE*	*15/19*	*20/29*	*30/49*	*50+*
Base:	1192	640	552	190	393	609	181	374	436	134
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Yes	32	40	23	42	35	27	30	37	34	16
No	60	52	70	50	57	65	56	57	59	76
Not sure	8	8	7	8	8	8	14	6	7	8

	Residence in UK			*Fluency in English*		
	Years 10+	*Years 5/9*	*Years 0-5*	*Good*	*Poor*	*None*
	383	445	364	593	415	129
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Yes	40	35	21	46	22	3
No	55	56	71	45	71	91
Not sure	5	9	8	9	7	6

TABLE 20: Discrimination in Other Areas — Awareness of Procedure to be Adopted

	All	*Sex*		*Class*			*Age*			
		Male	*Female*	*ABC1*	*C2*	*DE*	*15/19*	*20/29*	*30/49*	*50+*
Base:	1192	640	552	190	393	609	181	374	436	134
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Yes	26	34	17	34	29	22	29	25	30	16
No	64	55	74	54	63	68	59	64	61	77
Not sure	10	11	9	12	8	10	12	11	9	7

	Residence in UK			*Fluency in English*		
	Years 10+	*Years 5/9*	*Years 0-5*	*Good*	*Poor*	*None*
	383	445	364	593	415	129
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Yes	34	27	17	38	17	5
No	60	59	74	50	74	89
Not sure	6	14	9	12	9	6

Overall, our respondents' knowledge about procedures for seeking redress where they have been victims of racial discrimination was very poor. Less than one-third of the sample claimed to know what to do. Of those who claimed to know what they would do in the field of housing, 59% said that they would approach the Race Relations Board followed by a further 11% who would approach the council or housing department; 9% would seek legal advice, 6% would approach the Community Relations Commission, 4% the Citizens Advice Bureaux and 4% the Police.

In the case of discrimination in employment, 54% would approach the Race Relations Board, 8% would approach the employment/labour exchange, 8% the union/shop steward, 6% would seek legal advice, and 4% would approach the Citizens Advice Bureaux.

Similarly, discrimination in other fields evoked similar patterns of responses. Only 26% of the respondents were aware of the procedure to be adopted.

In sum, there is a wide-spread lack of awareness in relation to:

(i) What is racial discrimination; and

(ii) What should be done when faced with racial discrimination.

This lack of awareness is much more pronounced among women,

those aged 50 or over, those who have recently arrived in the UK (less than 5 years residence), those who are not fluent in English and those who are in the DE socio-economic group i.e. working class.

It is worth remembering that this degree of awareness relates to the period when the Race Relations Act 1968 was in force and had been in force for a decade or so. What about the new legislation, i.e. Race Relations Act 1976, which is in operation now? If there are any lessons to be learned from the above evidence, the situation certainly calls for immediate action on the part of various authorities in making people aware of their rights and procedures under the Race Relations Act 1976. Clearly, local community relations councils/committees, the Commission for Racial Equality, local radio and television network, all have a crucial role to play in informing people about their rights. Ethnic minority broadcasting can be used in this particular way.

Chapter Five: General Attitudes to Asian Programmes on Radio and TV

In previous chapters, we stressed the need for the media in a multi-ethnic society to reflect its composition as well as the problems which are experienced by different sections of the population. As Kenneth Lamb put it "the BBC has to take account of the fact that we no longer live in a monolithic society but in a pluralistic one. Religious and moral beliefs, social attitudes and conventions, are no longer as widely shared as they used to be. The areas of general concensus have dwindled. The BBC cannot ignore the changes taking place in the society".[18] To what extent does the BBC reflect the range of cultural interests in this society? To what extent does it confine itself to the narrow majority view?

This issue goes beyond the terms of reference of this study. Nevertheless, we shall look at this question from the other end and discuss the extent to which the views of our respondents are reflected in Asian programmes; we go on to examine the sorts of programme content that they would like to see in these programmes. The BBC's view on this has been that it is no part of their function to encourage Asians in Britain to abandon their own culture and traditions; rather "its aim has been to assist integration, not to promote assimilation". The Asian programmes on radio and TV, the BBC stresses, were designed to inform, to educate and to entertain.

What then are the general attitudes of our respondents to Asian language programmes on radio and television with respect to their musical content, religious content, language teaching and information content, and their appeal to young people.

Music

A higher level of demand was expressed for modern Asian music than for classical Asian music. 67% of those interviewed expressed a desire for more modern Asian music while 54% would like more classical music. It was especially among the younger age groups that modern music was preferred (for details see Table 21).

One-third of the Asians agreed that "Asian radio programmes have too much English pop music" but only 6% felt strongly about it. Young people were least likely to agree with this statement. In fact, as is shown

in Table 21, a high proportion of them (15-19 years age group) disagreed with the statement. Asian parents felt that this trend is due to the influence of Western values to which young Asians are constantly exposed. On the other hand, over half of those in the older age groups (50 +) would like these programmes to include more classical Asian music.

TABLE 21*: Musical Content of Asian Programmes

	All	*Age*				
		12/14	*15/19*	*20/29*	*30/49*	*50+*
Base:	1192	67	181	374	436	134
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Asian Radio Progs. should play more modern Asian music						
Agree	68	74	74	70	67	60
Disagree	14	10	15	15	13	11
Asian Radio Progs. should play more Asian classical music						
Agree	54	47	52	56	53	56
Disagree	29	35	35	29	28	15
Asian Radio Progs. have too much English pop music						
Agree	34	41	24	37	37	25
Disagree	43	46	64	42	39	28

*This Table does not include "Don't knows".

Religion and Culture

76% of our respondents thought that it would be a good idea for these programmes to include a large amount of religious material. Approximately the same proportion (78%) felt that it would be a good idea to have more programmes for young Asians about life and culture in Bangladesh, India and Pakistan.

With regard to those who do not speak English, 89% of the sample felt that it would be a good idea to have "more programmes designed for older people who speak no English", and 55% thought this would be a *very* good idea.

There is still as strong desire among Asians to maintain links with their

TABLE 22*: Suggestions for Inclusion in Asian Radio Programmes — Music

	All	*Age*				
		12/14	*15/19*	*20/29*	*30/49*	*50+*
Base:	1192	67	181	374	436	134
	%	%	%	%	%	%
More Asian popular music						
Very good	41	49	49	48	36	26
Fairly good	43	34	39	42	47	41
Not very good	6	9	6	4	7	10
Not very good at all	2	3	2	1	2	3
More Asian Classical music						
Very good	28	24	25	30	26	35
Fairly good	39	33	39	40	41	35
Not very good	18	27	19	17	17	14
Not at all good	7	12	13	6	6	4

*This Table excludes "Don't knows".

countries of origin. An overwhelming majority (81%) of our respondents expressed the view that more news about what happens in Bangladesh/India/Pakistan should be included in Asian programmes. On this subject, the younger groups (12-14) and those who are older than 30+ years of age have similar views. The length of time they have lived in the UK seems to have no noticeable effect on this view. Only 14%, and mainly those who were both born in and came from East Africa, did not think it would be a good idea to include more news about the Sub-Continent in Asian programmes.

Language Teaching for Adults

Throughout this report, we have touched on various issues which impinge on the language deficiencies of some Asians,[19] especially Asian women. Asian language programmes have a vital role to play in breaking down the resultant feelings of alienation among these groups. Broadcasting, because it enters the home, could particularly help Asian women to improve their fluency in the English language.[20]

It was in this context that 84% of the respondents said that more programmes should be designed to teach English to Asian women. A similar proportion felt that more programmes should be designed to

teach English to all Asians who need it. This is a positive attitude which shows that Asians recognise their need to learn English. For this reason, we welcome the attempt by the BBC Adult Education Department to produce "Parosi" programme to help Asian women with their English. It is too early to assess its impact though the Asian Press criticised the way it was produced in the past.[21] However, effective monitoring would be needed to assess the success of this programme.

Young People

One of the criticisms of Asian programmes submitted in evidence to the Annan Committee by some Asian organisations was "that there were not enough programmes for young Asians..."[22] 83% of the Asians interviewed thought that it would be a good idea if more opportunities were offered to Asian young people to put their views across, through Asian programmes.

On the other hand, older people were reluctant to support the idea that young Asians should be given more access to these programmes. Only 21% of those aged 50+ thought it was a very good idea. The reason for their reluctance has to do with their feeling that young Asians are already over-exposed to British society through various situations. They fear that this over-exposure to Western values is already resulting in conflict with their parents.

However, some respondents felt that Asian programmes should include material which help young people to learn more about their own culture because sufficient information about British institutions is transmitted through other programmes.

Information

In Chapter 4 we identified issues which concern Asians most. Yet our respondents generally felt that little information concerning these issues are usually discussed in special Asian programmes. 25% of the respondents felt that none of the radio programmes they had heard tells them quite the sort of things they wish to know. Accordingly, 85% expressed the view that it would be a good idea if Asian programmes on radio included more information about the health service (44% thought it was a *very* good idea). As presented in Table 23, their reactions to other types of information they would like to receive include "more information about Asian community events (88% thought it a good idea and, of this, 37% thought it a *very* good idea), more about events for people in the area — white, Asian and other groups — (76% thought this a good idea and 31% a *very* good idea) and more information about how to deal with Leicester City Council (79% thought this a good idea and

30% a *very* good idea).

This overall desire for more information through Asian programmes is justified by the lack of awareness among Asians of the benefits and services outlined in Chapter 4. In coping with the adjustment problems of everyday life, information about benefits and services plays an important part. In the light of the scale of consumption of Asian programmes, we have no doubt that these programmes are the best medium for making Asians aware of their surroundings and, in particular, of their rights and obligations in the community.

Community Relations

The first step in promoting good relations between different groups is for these groups to get to know about each others' customs, backgrounds, etc. Accordingly, 62% of our respondents agreed (and 55% did so very strongly) that "if Asian language programmes told me more about the customs of white people they would help community relations in this area". However, 25% disagreed with this idea. These were the older people who fear an erosion of their cultures if they tried to learn and then adopt the customs of white people. This is natural because when people move from one country to another, especially from a rural environment to a cosmopolitan one, they tend to be more protective of their cultures than they would be in their country of origin. This applies to Asians in Britain as well as to other groups. Further, most Asians have strong links with the Sub-Continent and with their extended families; they invest their savings in property in their home countries and make regular visits home. All these factors help them to reinforce their identity while they are in Britian.[23]

However, 77% of Asians would like to know more about community relations through Asian programmes and 75% would like to have more information about the provisions of the Race Relations Act, 1976.

Most Important Subject Which Should be Included on Radio/TV Programmes

In order to determine whether we had left out other important issues from our survey, we asked respondents: "what do you think is the most important subject that should be covered in a radio or television programme for Asians?" The two most common answers were Asian films on television and more entertainment, songs etc. in all programmes.

Our overall evidence therefore suggests a clear-cut need for more specialised Asian programmes to fulfil the needs of their audience. The BBC, founded on the principle of responsible public service, should reflect this need.

TABLE 23: Opinions On Future Programme Content

	Very good %	*Fairly good* %	*Not V. good* %	*Not at all good* %	*Don't know* %
More programmes designed for older people who speak no English	55	34 (89)	5	2	3
More programmes designed to teach English to Asian women	49	35 (84)	8	4	2
More programmes designed to teach English to all Asians	47	37 (84)	4	5	5
More information about health service facilities	44	41 (85)	7	3	4
More news about what happens in India/Pakistan/Bangladesh	43	38 (81)	10	4	4
More Asian popular music	41	43 (84)	6	2	7
More opportunity for Asian young people to put their views	38	45 (83)	8	3	6
More programmes for young people about life and culture in India/Pakistan/Bangaldesh	38	40 (78)	11	5	5
More information about Asian community events	37	51 (88)	5	1	6
More about Asian religions	37	39 (76)	14	5	5
More about how to deal with racial discrimination	37	37 (74)	11	4	11
More information about the 1976 Race Relations Act	36	39 (75)	8	4	12

More about events for all the people in the area, white, Asian, or other groups	31	45 (76)	11	4	8
More information about how to deal with the Leicester City Council	30	49 (79)	8	2	10
More about community relations matters	28	49 (77)	10	3	9
More about general current affairs	27	47 (74)	11	3	10
More Asian classical music	28	39 (67)	18	7	6
More programmes about the customs of white people	15	43 (58)	20	13	8

Chapter Six: Conclusions

Good race relations and equality of opportunity in Britain depend on the creation of understanding between ethnic minorities and the majority community. As we have indicated in Chapter 1, the way the press and broadcasting media report issues pertaining to ethnic minorities and race relations and the extent to which ethnic minorities are given the opportunity to use these channels to obtain information, entertainment and cultural satisfaction is of crucial importance in achieving this understanding.

We have shown in this report that Asians value their special programmes on radio and television and an overwhelming majority consume them. The evidence suggests that two out of three of those who ever listen to radio do so regularly and a further one in four listen occasionally to ethnic minority programmes on local radio. 32% also mentioned having listened to BBC Radio 1, but no other station was mentioned by more than 7% of the listeners.

As far as the Asian TV programme "Nai Zindagi Naya Jeevan" is concerned, 67% of those interviewed claimed that they watch it regularly. Those who are not fluent in English are much more likely to watch this programme. Inadequate command of the English language, or indeed, no knowledge of it at all, still creates problems for many Asians and increases their dependence on such programmes. Young middle class people whose main language at home is English and those who were born in Britain are rather less likely to watch this programme. On the whole, the study indicates that ethnic minority programmes will become an even more important means of maintaining their cultural identity than they have been so far.

The Annan Committee recommended that the "Broadcasting Authorities should provide programmes which introduce new-comers to the life and morals of this country, which reflect their own cultures and which enable others to understand and appreciate these cultures".[24] We welcome the efforts already being made by the BBC in this direction on their national radio network, TV and local radio. On the other hand, the IBA have started some programmes on local radio for ethnic minorities though they have not yet shouldered this responsibility in the field of

television. The IBA Charter includes a requirement that a proportion of its programmes had to be of British origin and had to reflect the tastes and outlook of people in local areas; further, if languages other than English were in common use in these areas, then a suitable proportion of programmes should be in those languages. This surely qualifies Asians and other ethnic minority groups for special programmes.

We think that such programmes for ethnic minorities should be increased not the least because Britain lags far behind other Western European countries in the number of programme minutes that are devoted to such programmes. More and better programmes should be provided if ethnic minorities are to be seen as equal participants in society, with a natural right to their cultural and linguistic identity. Compared with the situation of "guest workers" in other Western European countries, the overwhelming majority of the ethnic minority population in Britain are here to stay. They belong to this country. Ethnic minority broadcasting should be seen within this framework. The growth of these programmes on local radio took place in a haphazard way, in the absence of a coherent policy. The need for such a policy is underlined by the results we have presented.

In this report, we dealt with the audience's knowledge, consumption patterns and attitudes to ethnic minority programmes and not with technical details concerning their production or, for that matter, the material or manpower resources which they require. However, the Minority Arts Report and the production staff at the BBC's Asian Programmes Unit consider that programmes for ethnic minorities are starved of finance and other facilities.[25] For this reason, the quality of these programmes is usually less than they could have been. This feeling has also been expressed by many articulate Asians, and by the Asian Programmes Advisory Committee of the BBC. We have seen that ethnic minority programmes are one of the most important means of satisfying Asians' needs for information and entertainment in their own language. Our results clearly indicate that Asians place great value on these programmes compared with other programmes.

However, the timing of these programmes needs further thought in the light of our results. The conference of the National Association of Indian Youth held from 3-5 September 1976 in Sheffield, passed two resolutions which underline this problem:

1. "This Conference deplores the attitude of the BBC authorities in showing the only existing TV and Radio Programme for Asians at the most inconvenient times."
2. "This Conference deplores the disproportionately little amount of

time and resources allocated to BBC Programmes meant for Asian viewers and listeners.''[26]

These resolutions were sent to the Director-General of the BBC and clearly underlined the strong feeling among Asians about the lack of resources allocated to these programmes and their timing.

Many Asian organisations who submitted evidence to the Annan Committee stressed the need for more Asian language programmes on radio and on TV. Recently, the Indian Workers Association's Leicester Branch, requested the BBC to show Asian films on BBC 2 on Sundays when this channel would otherwise be closed down.[27] This request has to be seen in the light of the unavailability of Asian cinemas in some areas. It is worth noting that Canadian Television shows one Asian film every fortnight; yet the number of Asians in Canada is much smaller than that in Britain.

The needs of young Asians are also worthy of serious consideration. Their world at home is different from their world outside. Stress and conflict inevitably arise between generations. Young Asians need help to overcome this dilemma. Asian programmes could help them to bridge this gap by providing a forum for young people and their parents.

In this connection, the available evidence from the rest of Europe suggests that Sweden has the best policies in providing special programmes for ethnic minority groups. The Swedish Broadcasting Authorities, like the BBC, believe in a policy of special programmes for ethnic minorities. Some 4-5% of the population of Sweden are ethnic minorities, but the number of special programmes for them on radio and television is over three times that which is available in Britain where the ethnic minority population is only slightly smaller (3-4%). For instance, national programmes in Sweden amount to 3.3% and 2.2% of all television and radio programmes respectively as compared to the BBC's 0.6% and 0.1% respectively. In Autumn 1976, programmes for ethnic minorities in Sweden were relayed for 18 hours and 24 minutes per week. More than half of these were on TV including programmes for children. The programmes included 11.50 hours in Finnish, 2.42 in Greek, 2.42 in Serbo-Croat and 1.10 for Turkish minorities. Around the same period (1976-77), the BBC's output on television (both on Sundays and Wednesdays) was no more than 0.42% of its total output hours.[28] The radio output for ethnic minorities including programmes on local radio was roughly 1.8% of the total.

In Sweden, ethnic minority programmes are spread out over the week in such a way that they provide for a wider audience catchment and include members of the indigenous population who follow these on TV programmes by means of subtitles. In the U.K., on the other hand, there

is only one TV programme and it is never subtitled; further, it is transmitted only twice a week and at odd times.

The local radio experiment in Leicester called the "Six O'clock Show" is a positive development for the future. However, the unavailability of Audience Research figures dealing with the reaction of the general population in Leicester to this programme obviously does not enable us to draw any firm conclusions as to its penetration in that area. Equally, the unavailability of figures dealing with the reaction of the general population to ethnic minority programmes in English on other local radio stations makes it impossible for any conclusions to be drawn as to their penetration.

We repeat and endorse what we said in our comments on the Annan Committee Report, that an imaginative broadcasting policy in the area of race relations can bring the nation to "recognise the value of cultural and ethnic differences instead of expecting minorities to be assimilated into a single culture. It is not just ethnic minorities who are learning to live with a different culture. There is a parallel need for cultural understanding of ethnic minorities among the population as a whole". In this regard, it is worth stressing that the total of all ethnic minority groups in Britain is only about two million people, of whom over one million are Asians. They are heavily concentrated in the Greater London area (over 40% of Asians live in this area alone), the West Midlands, the North West and West Yorkshire. The total broadcasting provision for them compares badly with the total provision of say, Welsh language programmes for the 2.8 million people who live in Wales, a minority of whom speak Welsh and a negligible proportion of whom do not speak English at all. In the country as a whole, over 90% of Asians speak one or more Asian languages and over 70% speak English badly or not at all; indeed, over 80% of Asian women do not speak English at all. Yet, the number of existing programmes for Asians is smaller than those for the Welsh and are broadcast at relatively inconvenient times, as we have seen.[29]

Two further issues call for comment even though they did not feature in our survey; one is the clear need for more financial and staff resources to be made available for improving existing programmes and increasing their numbers and the second is, the need for ethnic minorities to be actually involved in the planning and broadcasting of these programmes. Discussions with producers of Asian programmes in the BBC during the course of this survey clearly suggest that these programmes are starved of resources and tend to be given a lower priority within the BBC relative to other programmes; they also underscored the lack of in-service training facilities for staff within the BBC to learn more about the background cultures of Asia which ought to be more fully reflected in these

programmes. We feel that this situation should be seriously and urgently reconsidered since these programmes play an important part in the lives of Asians as this survey has demonstrated. For the same reason, these programmes can be improved where young Asians are involved in such a way that those who are interested in making their careers in broadcasting can proceed to do so on the basis of the experience gained. We believe that the need for in-service training as specified above and the need for these programmes to act as a training ground for new recruits to broadcasting from the ethnic minority communities are closely linked.

It is probably true, as is usually asserted, that the British Broadcasting system is the best in the world; but if this is so, then neither the BBC nor the IBA can ignore the structure and composition of our multi-cultural society or be unresponsive to the changes which have taken place and are still taking place within it.

Chapter Seven: Recommendations

We welcome and appreciate the efforts already being made by the BBC in providing special programmes for ethnic minority communities to meet their special needs and interests. At the same time we note with regret that the IBA has not yet fully shared this responsibility especially with regards to television.

Under the Race Relations Act 1976 the Commission for Racial Equality has a general duty to work towards the elimination of unlawful racial discrimination and to promote equality of opportunity and good relations between persons of different racial groups. It is in this context and in the light of the evidence presented in this report that the Commission recommends that:

1. The BBC should have a coherent policy on ethnic minority broadcasting supported by an adequate funding and staffing strategy that would give higher priority to ethnic minority broadcasting than is the case at the moment. In this regard, more resources of finance, time and manpower should be allocated to ethnic minority broadcasting. The possibility of obtaining additional financial resources from all sources, but especially the EEC Social Fund, should be explored.
2. Special attention should be paid to improving and expanding existing programmes. For instance, programmes should include more information and more culture-related items such as Asian arts, Asian films etc.
3. Separate specialised programmes should be designed to meet the acute needs of Asian women, Asian children and Asian young people. The Commission welcomes "Gharbar" on BBC 2 on Wednesdays, "Parosi" on TV and the series of "Take Away English" on local radio. But these programmes should be monitored regularly to determine the extent to which they contribute to an improvement in the fluency in English of regular listeners.
4. Steps should be taken to produce television programmes for Asians on the regional TV network in areas where Asians live. If a fourth TV channel is established, it should provide more opportunities for

transmitting ethnic minority progammes.

5. Subtitles in English will encourage young Asians and the indigenous population to follow Asian TV programmes and, in this way, come to learn something about Asian cultures. The possibility of using or adapting the CEEFAX or ORACLE teletext services for this purpose should be explored.
6. As a result of the low priority which ethnic minority broadcasting commands, the existing programmes have lacked flair and originality. Increasing its priority within the broadcasting organisations should also ensure that the same creative standards as are applied to other programmes are applied to these programmes.
7. We have seen how effective local radio can be in reaching the Asian community. This ought to be taken into account in determining where new local radio stations should be sited.
8. More ethnic minority people should be encouraged to join Local Radio Advisory Councils, Regional Advisory Councils and National Advisory Councils who could advise on the coverage of all programmes including those which are directed at their communities.
9. The BBC should use these special programmes as a training ground for new presenters, technicians and producers from ethnic minority groups in order to enable them to make their careers in the mainstream broadcasting.
10. More in-service training facilities should be provided for producers presenters and technicians involved in producing these programmes. The Commission welcomes the initiative taken by the BBC in convening two conferences, over the last few years, of managers and producers of local radio stations. However, these conferences should be extended to include presenters and technicians.
11. Ethnic minority programmes should include more information about existing services, welfare rights and benefits, and legislation such as the Race Relations Act 1976.
12. Local authorities should exercise their power to assist community local radio under their existing general powers. For example, Section 137 of the Local Government Act 1972 gives local authorities the discretion to spend up to 2p in the £ on anything "which in their opinion is in the interest of their area or any part of it or all or some of its inhabitants". Clearly local radio programmes in general and ethnic minority programmes in particular meet the special needs of residents in local authority areas and therefore qualify for such grants from local authorities.
13. More programmes on local radio in English are needed, such as

Radio Leicester's experimental "Six O'Clock Show" to complement Asian language programmes but primarily designed for a wider audience for the same reason as in recommendation 5 above.

14. A greater degree of coordination between ethnic minority programmes on television and radio is needed.
15. The effectiveness of these programmes can only be determined by systematic monitoring. Audience Research surveys should include these programmes. Indeed it is very surprising that this has not been done in the past. We are aware that this will increase the cost of such surveys since interviewers would have to be recruited who can speak one or other of the Asian languages. Nevertheless, the significance of these programmes cannot be fully appreciated in the absence of such monitoring.
16. The IBA should also accept its share of responsibility for providing programmes to meet the special needs of ethnic minorities more fully than it has done in the past. In particular, television programmes for Asians should be developed as a matter of urgency and existing local radio programmes should be expanded.
17. Regular consultations and meetings should take place between the Commission and the broadcasting authorities to keep the whole area of broadcasting and race relations under constant review. In order to do so, we recommend that a Consultative Committee be formed, consisting of Commission staff, BBC, and IBA representatives as well as representatives from ethnic minority communities.

Notes and References

1. Paul Lazersfeld and Robert K. Merton "Mass Communication, Popular Tastes and Organised Social Action" in Lyman Bryson (ed.) *Communication of Ideas*, New York, 1948 p. 107.
2. In all Western European countries, public broadcasting is controlled by the state to some extent. The BBC is independent of the State.
3. Lord Annan, *Report of the Committee on the Future of Broadcasting*, London, HMSO, 1977. See, in particular, the evidence submitted by the CRC, the RRB, WCCR and the Runnymede Trust.
4. British Actors' Equity Association, *Coloured Artists on British Television*, August, 1974; also Joseph R. Dominick and Bradley S. Greenberg, "Three Seasons of Blacks on Television" in *Journal of Advertising Research*, 10, 1970, pp 21-27, Bradley S. Greenberg "Non-whites on British Television" BBC Audience Research Department, No. VR/72/56, 1972, and Paul Hartmann and Charles Husband, (ed), *Racism and the Mass Media*, London: Davis-Poynter, 1974, includes the Report of a survey of ITV and BBC from 24/30 April, 1971.
5. Taisto Hujanen, *Immigrant Broadcasting and Migration Control in Western Europe*, University of Tampere, 1976, p. 46.
6. The Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe 1975 stresses the right of migrant workers to receive, as far as possible, regular information in their own language, covering both their countries of origin and their host countries. For details, see Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, *Final Act*, Helsinki, 1975, HMSO.
7. Address given by the then Home Secretary, Roy Jenkins in May 1966 to a meeting of Voluntary Liaison Committees, London NCCL 1966.
8. INFRATEST, *Die Bedeutung der ARD — Sonderprogramme für die ausländsichen Arbeitnehmer — Zusammenfassende Darstellung*, München, 1968 quoted in Taisto Hujanen *op-cit.*
9. WDR — *Medienreferat, Nutzung von Gastarbeitersendungen*, 1975 quoted in Taisto Hujanen *op-cit.*
10. Birgitta Löwander, *Immigrants and the Mass Media in Sweden: Yugoslav, Greek and Turkish Families*, Swedish Broadcasting Corporation, No. 9-76/77, 1977 p.8.
11. *Ibid.*
12. James D. Halloran "Mass Media and Race — A Research Approach" in *Race as News*, Unesco Press, 1974 p.33.
13. This survey and other work in Leicester also confirms this assumption.
14. Lord Annan, *op-cit.* p. 30.
15. Gerry Hynes, "Breaking Down Feelings of Isolation in an Alien Land — the BBC Broadcasts on Radio and Television for the Asian Community in Britain". *European Broadcasting Union Review*, January 1970.
16. See EEC Directive on Mother Tongue Teaching, DES, 1975.
17. For details see M. Anwar *Between Two Cultures*, Community Relations Commission, 1976 and M. Anwar "Young Asians' Attitudes: Between Two Cultures," *New Society*, vol. 37, No. 741, 1976 pp.563-565.
18. Kenneth Lamb, *The BBC and its Public*, April 1970.

19. Naomi Moldofsky "Language: Passport to Successful Immigration Adjustment" in *International Migration*, No. 3, 1972 pp. 131-35.
20. See figures in M. Anwar "Between Two Cultures", *op-cit.*
21. *Jang International* (Urdu daily), October 4, 11, 18 and 25, 1977 editions. Comments such as "in spite of its length, the series will not fulfil its objectives", "New Serial Fell Victim to Overcasting", "BBC-TV Want to Poke Fun At Asians", "An illustration of the most serious, misleading and wrong information about Asian traditions" etc. were expressed.
22. Annan Committee Report *op-cit.* See, in particular, the evidence submitted to the Committee by the National Association of Indian Youth.
23. See M. Anwar, "A Sociological Study of Pakistanis in a Northern Town in England, Ph.D. Thesis, University of Bradford, 1977; also Roger Ballard, "Family Organisation among Sikhs in Britain", *New Community*, Vol. 2, 1973 pp. 12-24 and Badr Dahya "Pakistanis in Britain, Transients or Settlers?" *Race*, Vol. 14 1973, pp.246-77.
24. Lord Annan *op-cit*, p. 351.
25. *Ibid* p. Also see Naseem Khan, *The Arts Britain Ignores*, Community Relations Commission, 1976.
26. Bhikhu Parekh (Ed.), *Leadership and Media in the Asian Community*, Report of a Conference organised by the National Association of Indian Youth, 1977, p.10.
27. *Akhbare-a-Waton* (Urdu weekly), 11th January, 1978.
28. *BBC Handbook* 1978, London, British Broadcasting Corporation, 1977, pp. 130-133.
29. 0.8% of BBC Television's annual programmes is allocated to programmes in the Welsh language.

Appendix One: Sample Characteristics

			Total Sample 1,192
1.	**Sex:**	Male	54%
		Female	46%
2.	**Age Groups:**	*Years*	%
		12—14	6
		15—19	13
		20—29	31
		30—49	37
		50+	13
3.	**Religious Groups:**		%
		Hindus	71
		Muslims	13
		Sikhs	14
		Others	2
4.	**Social Class**		%
		ABC1	16
		C2	33
		DE	51

Note: Social class categories were derived from the occupation of the head of the household. For the purpose of analysis, these are described as ABC1, C2 and DE where:—

ABC1 corresponds to Managerial/Supervisory/White Collar Workers.

C2 corresponds to Skilled Manual Workers.

DE corresponds to Semi-and unskilled Manual Workers/those on pensions and other forms of social security payments.

5.	**Language Mainly Spoken at Home**		%
		English	7
		Hindi	1
		Gujarati	75

	Punjabi	15
	Urdu	1
	Other	1

Note: A few respondents gave more than one response.

6. **Country of Birth**		%
	Bangladesh	1
	Britain	2
	India	49
	Kenya	22
	Pakistan	1
	Uganda	13
	Other (East Africa)	7
	Other	5

7. **Country lived in prior to Coming to Britain** (based on all not born in Britain)

		%
	Bangladesh	1
	India	35
	Kenya	28
	Pakistan	1
	Uganda	18
	Other	5
	No answer/refused	12

8. **Length of Residence in Britain**		%
	Under 5 years	30
	5 — 9 years	37
	10—14 years	23
	15—19 years	7
	20 years or more	2
	No answer	1

Appendix Two: Ethnic Minority Programmes on BBC Local Radio

(1) Asian Programmes

Radio Station	*Name of Programme*	*Transmission Day*	*Transmission Time*	*Language Used*
BIRMINGHAM	"East in West"	Monday	1930-2100 hrs.	English
	"Gharana"	Mondays	1910-1930 hrs.	Hindi
	"Apna Hi Ghar Samajhiye"	Fridays previous Sunday's Radio 4 Broadcast	1930-2015 hrs.	Hindustani
BLACKBURN	"Mehfil"	Fridays	1845-1930 hrs.	Urdu
BRISTOL	"Mehfil & Take Away English"	Fridays	1845-1930 hrs.	Urdu
DERBY	"Sangham"	Thursdays	1850-2000 hrs.	Hindustani
LEEDS	"Jhankar "Jhalak"	Thursdays Sundays repeated	1830-1900 hrs. 1900-2000 hrs.	Bengali Hindustani
LEICESTER	"The Six Three O Show	Every week day x 4	1834-1930 hrs.	English
	"Milan"	Tuesday	1834-1930 hrs.	Hindi/Urdu
LONDON	"London Sounds Eastern"	Sundays	1900-2000 hrs.	English
MANCHESTER	"Eastward North Westwards"	Saturdays & Mondays	1830-1930 hrs. 1830-1930 hrs.	English
MEDWAY	"Sangham"	Wednesdays repeated on Saturdays	1930-2000 hrs. 1845-1930 hrs.	Hindustani
MERSEYSIDE	"Ijtama"	Saturdays including "Take Away English"	1900-1930 hrs. 1400-1420 hrs.	Hindustani

(1) Asian Programmes

Radio Station	*Name of Programme*	*Transmission Day*	*Transmission Time*	*Lanugage Used*
NOTTINGHAM	"Nawrang"	Fridays	1930-2100 hrs.	Urdu, Hindi, Gujarati
OXFORD	"Sabrang"	Mondays	1840-1900 hrs.	Hindustani
SHEFFIELD	"Majlis"	Saturdays	1805-1900 hrs.	Urdu & Bengali
STOKE	"Intikhab"	Mondays	1915-2000 hrs.	Urdu

(2) West Indian Programmes

Radio Station	*Name of Programme*	*Transmission Day*	*Transmission Time*	*Language Used*
BIRMINGHAM	"Reggae Reggae"	Sundays	1400-1500 hrs.	English
	"Jigsaw"	Sundays every fortnight Repeated Tuesdays every fortnight	1545-1605 hrs. 1920-1950 hrs.	English
LEEDS	"Calypso"	Sundays	1400-1430 hrs.	English
LEICESTER	"The Herdle White Show"	Saturdays	1400-1450 hrs.	English
LONDON	"Reggaetime"	Sundays (90 mins)	1300 hrs.	English
	"Black Londoners"	Fridays (90 mins) Sunday (repeat) (1 hr.)	2030 hrs. 1500 hrs.	English
MERSEYSIDE	"Meeting Place"	Wednesdays	1830-1900 hrs.	English
NOTTINGHAM	"Back a' Yard"	Mondays	1930-2100 hrs.	English

Note: Radio Newcastle and Solent do not have ethnic minority programmes as such but have recently started a series of "Take Away English".

Appendix Three: Contents (Random) of Asian Programmes on BBC Radio Leicester and BBC Television during the Fieldwork Phase

Basic content of Asian Programmes on Radio Leicester

MILAN	Tuesdays 6.34-8.00 pm (6.15-7.00 pm during fieldwork)
Language:	Hindi-Urdu
Content:	Topical interviews, record requests and dedications, Asian film music on disc, film reviews, children's story, 'live' Asian musical groups, local news bulletin, information, diary, phone-ins, English language teaching series "Take away English", general programme trails.
Presenters:	Three Asians (two male, one female).
The 6.30 Show	Monday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday 6.34-7.30 pm (6.16-7.00 pm during fieldwork)
Language:	English
Content:	News bulletin, record requests and dedications, Asian film music on disc, western pop discs, West Indian and black music on disc, topical interviews, information, diary, phone-ins, counselling service, competitions, recipes, Outside Broadcasts in the radio car, West Indian section to programme (15 mins) each Friday, general programme trails.
Presenters:	Three Asians (two female, one male) One Englishman One West Indian (Male)

RANDOM CONTENT OF THE 6.30 SHOW

Monday, 18th April 1977
Recipe.

Thursday, 21st April 1977
CRC Mobile Community Worker: Mr. Horspool talking about his work and problems he faces.

Monday, 16th May 1977
Radio Car on location
Recipe
Speech dedications

Thursday, 19th May 1977

Don talking to local football club

Elspeth looking at a Youth Club with a difference

Dr. Sayeed talking about Muslim education

Asian Christians introduce themselves

BBC T.V. "Nai Zindigi Naya Jeevan"

Sunday morning 9.00-9.30 a.m.

Repeat on Wednesday morning

transmitted on 10th April, 1977

Interview with Lord Avebury, Liberal Peer, on the Lib/Lab pact and the Liberals' policy on race relations and immigration.

Film of Bangladesh Independence Day Lunch held at the Grosvenor Hotel, Victoria, London, on 26th March.

Music item performed by Kishore Kumar.

transmitted on 1st May, 1977

News Bulletin

Film of David Lane, Chairman, Commission for Racial Equality, addressing a Bangladeshi Youth Conference held by Federation of Bangladesh Associations U.K.

Discussion on the implications of the Government's green paper on nationality law with Sibghat Kadri, Standing Conference of Pakistani Organisations and Zia Chishti, Tribunal Counsellor UKIAS.

Skit on a cricket commentary and music item performed by Ila Arun.

transmitted on 15th May, 1977

News Bulletin.

Interview with Dr. Syed Ali Ashraf, Organising Secretary, First World Conference on Muslim Education, Mecca, on the education of Muslim children in multi-racial societies.

Discussion on the Press Council's rejection of the C.R.C.'s report on the media with Syed M. Mustafa, Honorary Secretary, Foreign Press Association, and Dr. Muhammad Anwar, Reference Officer, C.R.C.

Dance item performed by Kiran Segal.

transmitted on 22nd May, 1977

News Bulletin.

Interview with Dr. N. Sabharwal on the recurrence of tuberculosis.

Interview with Mr. R. N. Kapur on the Open University.

Music item performed by Mr Deshpande.

transmitted on 5th June, 1977

News Bulletin.

Interview with Mrs. F. Zakaria on the role of Asian women in today's society.

Interview with Mr. Mota Singh on 'How to Complain and Where'.

transmitted on 5th June, 1977

Invitation for applications for the Silver Jubilee Painting Competition.

Music item performed by Mrs. Shakera Iqbal.

transmitted on 19th June, 1977

News Bulletin.

Filmed interview with Indian Prime Minister, Morarji Desai at India House, London.

Interview with David Lane, new Chairman of the Commission for Racial Equality.

Music item performed by Hemanta Kumar.

Appendix Four: Relevant Paragraphs from the Annan Committee Report

4.5 **Diversity** The next requirement for good broadcasting in future is diversity. Our society's culture is now multi-racial and pluralist: that is to say, people adhere to different views of the nature and purpose of life and expect their own view to be expressed in some form or other. The structure of broadcasting should reflect this variety.

6.3 **Advisory Councils and Committees** Both the BBC and the IBA have a General Advisory Council. Both have National Councils or Committees in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. The BBC also has eight English Regional Advisory Councils. Both have Local Radio Councils or Committees. The BBC has a large number of special advisory committees, for example, on education, programmes for Asians, agriculture, appeals and music, and they told us that in all 850 men and women from different walks of life sit on their advisory bodies. The IBA also has a number of specialist advisory committees, for example, on advertising, education and appeals.

6.9 For one of the weaknesses of the present general advisory structure is that it is remote from most members of the audience. We think the Broadcasting Authorities should explore ways of getting advice from many more people. A few of the BBC's local radio stations had advertised for people to become members of the local radio council and some of the people who had been recruited in this way seemed to us far closer to the station's audience and more likely to reflect their views than many of those who spend most of their lives attending committees. Most people spend many hours watching television and listening to radio and we are sure they would be glad to help the broadcasters if they were asked, not just through the rather impersonal mechanisms of audience research but more directly, as part of a dialogue between the broadcasters and their audiences. Some of us thought such a dialogue could be opened up by appointing people whose job would be to go out and meet people in community centres and at local meetings and to seek their views. In time this could help the Broadcasting Authorities to draw the members of their advisory committees from a wider range of people.

14.46 Others saw cable developing as a service which disseminated local information, and met local needs. The GLC, the Association for Adult Education, the Workers' Educational Association and the Communist Party of Great Britain were among those who took this view. The Association of District Councils thought that voluntary community involvement had been one of the beneficial features of cable television. Many organisations stressed in addition the benefit cable could bring to education, among them the WEA, the National Institute of Adult Education, the Society of Industrial Tutors, the Association of Metropolitan Authorities' Education Committee and the Department of Education and Science. The Race Relations Board thought that cable distribution was singularly suitable for providing programmes for ethnic minorities. But the Open University considered that the prospect of distributing educational material by cable on a national network was very distant.

14.54 That is why we argue that cable television should develop as a local community service. It will probably develop that way in any case, because individual towns or districts will be wired up and capable of giving such a service many years before the greater part of the nation is served by broad band cable. The five experimental community stations failed for lack of funds, but they did not fail through lack of local interest and enthusiasm. We had the impression from the evidence we received from local organisations in these and other areas that there were a lot of people who would like to join in if opportunities were provided for communicating with the local community; and it may well be that the Swindon experiment will prove to be the one with the greatest potential for the future. In the last 50 years, broadcasting has been in the hands of professionals, but in recent years more and more people have been making programmes, many of a specialised kind, such as those for educational services. We do not go along with those who believe that in future men will communicate through pictures rather than through print. More modestly we guess that television and similar services are going to play a larger part in the communications of the future. All the more important, therefore, that a larger number of people should be able to make programmes as well as watch them. Community television seems to most of us to have two advantages. It extends the number of programme makers and takes programme making out of the charmed professional circle: and this in turn creates a more alert and selective television audience. If there are four television channels showing for the most part highly professional programmes, it is better for communities to learn to make their own programmes rather than arranging for additional

programme services to be provided by professional entertainment organisations. Cable television is one of the best ways in which a local community is able to communicate with itself. If people can walk into their local station, borrow equipment and use it as a means of talking to their neighbours, this is real access broadcasting. The station staff then become professional advisers to the community rather than programme makers.

14.55 Looking long ahead into the future, it may well be that after the turn of the century there will be a national cable network. At that stage, when many programme and other services will be available to every home, new forms of organisation will have to be conceived. That will be the task for our successors; at present it looks to us as if the responsibility for programme content will be divorced from responsibility for providing the cable network. At the other end of the scale, there are those who hold the view that what is transmitted on totally closed cable systems is the business of the law but not the Government; that if public airwaves are not used, there is no need and no case for public control. The next 25 years should be used to build up experience which suggests what form the new organisational arrangements should take.

14.56 These are the reasons why we recommend that cable television should develop primarily as a community service under the Local Broadcasting Authority. At present the Home Office is responsible for ensuring that the cable stations observe the terms of their licences. Since inevitably this responsibility would involve the Secretary of State in detailed programming questions, we recommend that the Local Broadcasting Authority should be responsible for all further experiments in organisation or in finance, in local cable services and for licensing the programme services; and for ensuring that the terms of the licence are adhered to. Sometimes the Authority will want to exercise the kind of supervision which it will be giving to a local radio station, for example, if the scheme in question covers a whole town and provides several hours programming a day financed by advertisements. On the other hand we hope that very small communities (for example, a single council estate or a small village of a few hundred people with a relay service) would be able to provide a community service with the minimum of restrictions which the Authority considers necessary, for example, to prevent Pay TV being introduced through a multiplicity of small systems. For most of these services, we envisage that transmission facilities would be provided by the Post Office or a relay company, but we consider the local Broadcasting Authority should be empowered to provide transmission by cable.

16.33 **Treatment of racial minorities** Does the broadcasters' treatment of coloured people in comedy and light entertainment programmes make race relations worse? The Community Relations Commission said that programmes like Thames Television's "Love Thy Neighbour" and BBC's "Till Death Us Do Part," instead of breaking down stereotypes and ridiculing the expression of racial prejudice, "reinforce and legitimise negative attitudes". The Race Relations Board wondered whether comedy programmes and jokes based on ethnic stereotyping "do not simply provide a respectable vehicle for the parading of prejudices". Although the Runnymede Trust, the Greater London Arts Association, the Minority Arts Report and the BBC's Asian Programmes Advisory Committee all echoed these criticisms, the BBC reported to us the result of a survey in 1973 of attitudes (which incidentally did not extend to the young) into "Till Death Us Do Part", which suggested that there was little or no change in attitudes as a result of viewing the series. All that happened was that liberals and illiberals alike took comfort and were sustained in their existing views.

16.34 Racial discrimination or insult is the most explosive social problem of our times resounding with national and international overtones. Yet those who try to get rid of it should remember that attempts to ban allusions to this evil nearly always rebound upon those who want to do good. Let us not be too heavy handed in reacting to comedy which is frequently based on caricature. That having been said, broadcasters ought to do more to ensure that their staff in all departments are aware how deeply offensive to coloured citizens of our country certain stereotypes and assumptions are, especially those stereotypes which make it appear that all members of a particular race invariably share the same characteristics. These assumptions fuel many of the tasteless and cruel jokes, particularly about Asians, which some comedians resort to as a way of raising a cheap laugh. Some people can be offended even by the relatively innocuous use of racial caricature in the Black and White Minstrel Show: one of us felt strongly that the time had come to stop "blacking-up" for this show. Broadcasters should occasionally ask themselves how well a national, provincial or racial minority in these islands is established before cracking jokes. Outrage can so easily be given to some, whereas others are so well established that they can take a few jokes at their expense without offence. The Scots and Yorkshiremen need no special protection: they can give every bit as well as they can take. We shall have more to say about the treatment of race relations in news and current affairs in the next chapter.

17.20 **Reporting on racial issues** We received some evidence on the balance which broadcasters are thought to have struck in their approach to racial issues. The Runnymede Trust considered that "very real efforts are now being made to present news about race relations and immigration in its context and with careful balancing of comments". Both the Runnymede Trust and the Race Relations Board were worried that broadcasters, like the press, simplified racial problems so that the only news items were stories of crime and conflict. Fiercer criticisms came from the Wandsworth Council for Community Relations. They cited specific programmes where they believed the broadcasters had shown preconceived ideas about community relations, had mishandled the participants, had misused their contacts and had produced misleading interviews. The Community Relations Commission (CRC) suggested that broadcasters should take a conscious decision according to the nature of the news whether or not to report that a person referred to in a news story was from a particular ethnic group.

17.21 In view of the evidence, we invited the BBC to prepare a memorandum for us on broadcasting and racial minorities. The BBC thought that they had produced illuminating programmes on race relations, but, however well these were done, they drew criticism from one quarter or another. The BBC were aware of the danger of publicising white or coloured extremists. They said that they "did not believe that a man of any race, who speaks in favour of racial intolerance is entitled to the same treatment by the BBC as the man who condemns it". In reply to the recommendation by the CRC, the BBC quoted their guide for reporters which stated that unless a person's race was relevant to the story it should not be mentioned.

17.22 We thought this was sensible and honest. News reports can feed people's fears. Nevertheless, we are opposed to the suppression of news in matters of public concern. If broadcasters suppress stories which discredit members of racial minorities, racialists will use this as a weapon for their own propaganda. Broadcasters do not have to be impartial on matters where Parliament has established what is and what is not acceptable to the law. But they need to take care that discussion programmes do not take the form of a verbal punch-up in which recent immigrants, whose command of English may not be good, appear to the public as excitable or unintelligible. The public should be given a more adequate reflection of what people who are member of racial minorities think on ordinary issues of the day and not merely on the highly charged issues of immigration and race relations. As with industrial

affairs, to achieve proper coverage means examining community relations at times of harmony as well as times of strife.

18.5 **Attitudes to Access Programmes** The enthusiasm of the BBC and of the IBA for these programmes was somewhat more muffled. They inclined to see them as adjuncts to the professionally produced output. The BBC told us they regarded access programmes as one of the ways to broaden their range of contributors. These programmes particularly helped such groups as racial minorities who were trying to change the way society perceived them and the way in which they perceived themselves. The BBC saw a future in which there would be special minority radio and television networks open to anyone who could raise the money and satisfy trustees for the network that they should find a place on their schedules — common land on which anyone could give his ideas a run. The IBA too, told us that access programmes were likely to stimulate other types of production. They thought the regional schedules were particularly suited to what they described as halfway house programmes on television, in which the public were allowed to say what they felt about particular issues within a professionally produced programme. The ITCA also believed that the combination of the technical expertise of professionals in the local television station with "the passion of campaigners and crusaders" could produce sincere programmes of high quality. It was important, however, that the views of the favoured group should be challenged, often in discussion with those holding different views, because it supplied balance and made for "better television".

18.12 In our view the possibilities for access can best be realised at local or regional levels and we recommend that any extension in the time devoted to access programmes should be concentrated on these levels. In the locality the lack of experience of the programme makers will be less important than the relevance of the programmes and the participation of the community; more people can also get an introduction into the techniques of programme making and therefore understand more about broadcasting. We do not advocate the demise of national access programmes, but we think they would be better made by individuals or groups who had already at a local level made programmes which were likely to cause widespread interest if they were put on the air before the nation as a whole. There may well also be effective opportunities for development on the fourth channel and at some future date in local television.

21.8 **Broadcasting Performances of the Arts** First, and most importantly, broadcasting was expected to provide people with performances of the arts. Very many people who wrote letters to us expressed their deep appreciation of broadcasts of classical music. Numbers of people also clearly enjoyed the broadcasting of classic drama on radio and television. The Society of Authors praised the energy and imagination of the BBC's Radio Drama and Features Department. The Arts Council of Great Britain summed up the views of many who wrote to us when they told us they wanted to see broadcast more of the best works of the major opera, drama or ballet companies. There were some, however, who felt that the broadcasters had neglected certain art forms. The Full House Poets wanted more time and effort given to the presentation of poetry, and the Minority Arts Report thought that the broadcasters did not pay sufficient attention to reflecting the artistic interests of the ethnic minorities.

23.20 **Programmes for Ethnic Minorities** The importance of identifying a real need among the audience was where we started when we began to consider programmes for ethnic minorities. The BBC told us that in July 1965 they organised two conferences, one of representatives of West Indian organisations and one of Asians, to discuss whether their communities needed special programmes. The West Indian conference said firmly that they did not: special programmes would be likely only to emphasise their separateness. The Asian representatives, however, said they did: special programmes could help to break down feelings of alienation, particularly among Asian women, which resulted from differences of religion, culture and language. As a result of these views, the BBC established what is now known as the Asian Programmes Unit which is based in Birmingham and helped by the Asian Programmes Advisory Committee.

23.21 Since October 1965 the BBC has therefore responded to the need expressed by Asian people to have their own programmes. Each week on BBC Television a 30 minute magazine programme "Nai Zindagi Naya Jeevan" (New Life) is broadcast on Sunday morning at 9.00 am on BBC 1 and is repeated on Wednesdays on BBC 2 at 10.35 am. There is no comparable provision on ITV. BBC network radio broadcasts a 30 minute programme at 7.15 am on Sundays on BBC Radio 4. After consulting their Advisory Committee, the BBC decided that these programmes should generally be broadcast in a simple form of mixed Hindi and Urdu. In addition, those BBC local radio stations which operate in areas where there are substantial Asian communities provide

specialist programmes using the most commonly-understood Asian language in the locality, which might be Hindi/Urdu, Bengali, Gujarati or Punjabi. Some of these programmes are produced by the stations themselves and some by the BBC's Asian Programmes Unit. There are also some programmes of special interest to West Indians and to Jewish people. A few Independent Local Radio stations have followed BBC local radio's lead and broadcast some programmes in one of the Asian languages. The BBC told us that their programmes for Asians were reaching the audience for which they were intended and were much appreciated.

23.22 That was clear from the evidence received. The interest the programmes created far outweighed their unassuming place in radio and television programme schedules. As might be expected the dominant views were appreciative and critical: appreciative that the BBC was willing to put on programmes for Asians at all, critical that the BBC did not do more. That the BBC has its problems was all too evident in the submission we received. The programmes were broadcast too early in the day according to the Asian Programmes Advisory Committee, the Community Relations Commission, the Ealing Community Relations Council, the Standing Conference of Asian Organisations in UK, and the Asian Broadcasts Listeners and Viewers Association of the Midlands. There should be more programmes for Asians each week, according to the Indian Workers Educational and Cultural Forum, the Wandsworth Council for Community Relations and a number of others. The Minority Arts Report and the production staff in the BBC's Asian Programmes Unit considered that the programmes were starved of finance and facilities. The Ealing Community Relations Council, the Asian Broadcasts Listeners and Viewers Association of the Midlands and the National Association of Indian Youth thought the quality of the programmes was not good enough and suggested they could be made more entertaining and more professional. There were criticisms too that there were not enough programmes for young Asian children. Nor were there enough programmes catering for the different cultures and arts of the sub-continent. Even the choice of language caused some controversy. The Ealing Community Relations Council believed more programmes should use other Asian languages including Gujarati, Punjabi and Bengali. The Federation of Bangladesh Associations, UK suggested that Bengalis should have their own television programme on a regular basis. Quite a number of Asian organisations sought more representation on the BBC's Asian Programmes Advisory Committee and some representation on other BBC advisory committees.

23.23 The Asians were not the only ones interested in having their own programmes. The Board of Deputies of British Jews suggested the BBC Radio London programme for Jewish people should be broadcast nationally. Ealing Community Relations Council suggested programmes for the Irish and West Indian communities, and the Minority Arts Report added the Chinese and Cypriot communities. It was not surprising, therefore, that the Community Relations Commission suggested that the Authorities appoint full-time advisers to cope among other matters with this flood of advice.

23.24 We agree that special programmes must be made for certain ethnic minorities. We were disturbed, therefore, that the Wednesday repeat of Sunday morning's television programme for Asians was for a time dropped from the BBC programme schedules, and we welcome its reinstatement. We are certainly sympathetic to the wish of the producers of the Asian Programmes Unit to use the time on Wednesday not for a repeated programme, but for a programme which could cater specifically for the language difficulties of Asian women. If the job is going to be done, it must be done well. That is why we plead for adequate finance and facilities for individual programmes. But time is another matter. Minorities, whether ethnic or otherwise always demand, and have some claim to, a disproportionate amount of time in broadcasting. There are limits to the 'broadcasters' ability to meet such claims. The production of well-financed specialist programmes cannot be carried to the point where the interests of the whole audience in the United Kingdom are neglected. Even if the BBC shared this commitment with ITV or the fourth channel, they could never meet the demand from all ethnic groups or, if they attempted to do so, they would affront the needs and expectations of the audience as a whole. The needs of these groups, however, will not go away by failing to recognise them. One of the themes in our Report has been that broadcasters should serve not only one group of society, but the many groups and societies which together make up the nation as a whole. It may be that the nation will come to recognise the value of cultural and ethnic differences instead of expecting minorities to be assimilated into a single culture. In response to this the broadcasters must consider how they can best meet the varied needs of different cultures, while continuing to provide a service of programmes which can be accepted and appreciated by most people in the country. That is why we believe ITV should be expected to provide programmes for minority ethnic groups in this country. The answer may also lie partly in using local broadcasting to meet the particular needs of those who live in the locality. We were interested, for example, to receive a proposal

from Mr John Greenaway — though we do not specifically endorse it — for using cable for such a specialised service. We recommend that the Local Broadcasting Authority should permit local cable services to provide programmes in particular ethnic groups in their locality. They should also study how local radio stations can meet the needs and interests of ethnic minorities in the locality. With this in mind we welcomed reports that the Community Relations Commission had made a grant of £3,000 to BBC Radio London to provide more frequent programmes for West Indians and Africans in London. We understand BBC Radio London's Jewish programmes are also aided financially by the Board of Deputies of British Jews. There is no reason why parts of the service to local communities should not be enhanced in this way as long as the broadcasters ensure that they retain editorial responsibility for these programmes.

23.25 The BBC put to us an interesting proposition about the future of some of these programmes. They told us that their programmes for Asians were evolving from being aimed at those newly arrived in the country, to being intended for those who had been brought up in the UK and were inevitably exposed to the cultural conflicts inherent in living in one culture at home and another at school or work. The BBC looked to the time when programmes intended for this second generation of Asians would normally be broadcast in English. All those who had difficulty using English, including Asians, would be provided for through the educational output. That surely is right. But there is also room for programmes which make the cultures of ethnic minorities more intelligible to the rest of the British. It is not, after all, just ethnic minorities who are learning to live with a different culture. There is a parallel need for cultural understanding of ethnic minorities among the population as a whole. We recommend therefore that the Broadcasting Authorities should provide programmes which introduce their own cultures and which enable others to understand and appreciate these cultures.

28.24 **Policies on Racial Minorities** Concern was expressed, too, about the employment of members of ethnic minorities. Equity sent us a copy of their 1968 report which argued how few opportunities there were for Afro-Asian artists. Equity's views were supported by the Race Relations Board, while the Community Relations Commission believed that one reason for the "unsatisfactory" number of minority groups employed as actors was that the "broadcasting organisations themselves had few, if any, staff at executive level drawn from the minorities". Several

organisations drew attention to the fact that there was only one coloured news reporter and no "status figures, either as announcers, chairmen of discussions or even as participants in serious discussion programmes". Bodies such as the Standing Conference of Asian Organisations in the United Kingdom argued that personnel from among minority groups should be recruited and trained. The BBC sent us a special memorandum on this subject. They supported and practised integrated casting according to the spirit and the letter of the Race Relations Act. But they had to find the "best available talent" and, within the open competitive system and the other personnel policies which they pursued, records of Afro-Asians employed were by no means complete, mainly because it was not the BBC's policy to record colour, race or ethnic origin in their personnel data. Similarly, the BBC in Northern Ireland were unable to tell us how many Catholics and Protestants were employed there.

28.25 Equal opportunities pose problems for the whole of society and not merely for the broadcasting organisations. Many employers now recognise that they have a social obligation to adopt more positive policies. It is not enough to say "we treat everyone alike". Nor, on the other hand, is it necessary to rush into positive discrimination or quotas. What is needed first and foremost, is information. The virtuous refusal to identify often abets a disinclination in another quarter to deal with inequalities. The BBC, at least, is not indifferent to these problems, but we consider all the broadcasting organisations must discuss these problems with the unions and publish, not merely their policies, but the procedures designed to give effect to the policies. We recommend that clear policies on the employment of women and ethnic minorities should be formulated and promulgated throughout the organisation. It has been suggested that one senior person be made responsible for seeing that the policies are carried out and that the board of the organisation is kept informed periodically. We recognise that there is a risk that such special responsibility will come to be regarded as exclusive responsibilty and that everyone else will feel that they need not take any action themselves. These matters should be the concern of all managers. So long as this risk is recognised, it would be helpful to have responsibility designated in this way.

Appendix Five: Ethnic Minority Broadcasting: Interview

SCHEDULE

OFFICE USE ONLY
Job No: 47705 (1-5) Backchecked: .....
Serial No: (6-9) Accompanied: .....

INTERVIEW DETAILS

Name of respondent
Mr/Mrs/Miss .....
Full postal address: .....
.....
.....

Interviewer's Name: .....
Interviewer's No. [ ][ ] (14-15)

Date of interview: ...../1977
Day of week of interview: (16)

Mon .... 1 Fri 5
Tues .....2 Sat 6
Wed. .....3 Sun 7
Thurs 4

ROUTE NO. [ ][ ] (10-11) TRANSFER FROM CONTACT SHEET
ADDRESS NO. [ ][ ]
NO. AT ADDRESS AGED 12 OR MORE [ ][ ] (12-13)

Was anyone else present? (IF YES, WRITE IN WHO) Yes ....X No ....Y

.....

Length of interview:
Start ..... am/pm Finish: ..... am/pm

HOUSEHOLD DETAILS

Occupation of Head of Household

Work done: .....
Type of firm: .....
Grade/position: .....
No. of staff responsible for: .....
Relevant qualifications: .....
.....
.....
Other details: .....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

Relationship of Respondent to Head of H/H (17)

Head of household 1
Wife 2
Parent 3
Child 4
Grandchild 5
Other relative 6
Lodger 7

Social Class (18)
AB 1
C1 2
C2 3
D 4
E 5

Children in H/H (19)
None under 21 1
Any aged 0-5 2
Any aged 6-10 3
Any aged 11-16 4
Any aged 16+ in fulltime education 5
Any aged 16+ not in education full-time 6

RESPONDENT DETAILS

Sex: (20)
Male 1
Female 2

Marital Status
Married with children 4
Married no children 4
Not married (single/ widowed/divorced).... 6

Age: (21)
12-14 1
15-16 2
17-19 3
20-24 4
25-29 5
30-39 6
40-49 7
50-59 8
60 + ... 9

Religion: (22)
Muslim 1
Hindu 2
Sikh 3
Christian 4
Agnostic 5
OTHER 6

.....

WORK STATUS OF RESPONDENT (23)

Working full time (30 + hrs) on shift work 1
Working full time (30 + hrs) *not* shift work 2
Working part time (8-29 hrs) on shift work 3
Working part time (8-29 hrs) *not* shift work 4
Not working or seeking work (e.g. housewife, retired) 5
Unemployed, seeking work 6
Student/still at school 7

Ask all working: Hours worked on last full working day:

Start time (24)	Finish (25)
6.00am-8.59am... 1	6.00am-8.59am... 1
9.00am-11.59am .. 2	9.00am-11.59am .. 2
12noon-2.59pm .. 3	12noon-2.59pm .. 3
3.00pm-5.59pm .. 4	3.00pm-5.59pm .. 4
6.00pm-8.59pm .. 5	6.00pm-8.59pm .. 5
9.00pm-11.59pm.. 6	9.00pm-11.59pm.. 6
12 midnight to 2.59am 7	12 midnight to to 2.59am 7
3.00am-5.59am... 8	3.00am-5.59am... 8

A.
LANGUAGE

Language of interview (26)
English 1
Hindi 2
Gujarati 3
Punjabi 4
Urdu 5
Bengali 6
Other 7
(WRITE IN)

Language mainly spoken at home (27)
English 1
Hindi 2
Gujarati 3
Punjabi 4
Urdu 5
Bengali 6
Other 7
(WRITE IN)

Mother tongue (language national origin) (28)
English 1
Hindi 2
Gujarati 3
Punjabi 4
Urdu 5
Bengali 6
Other 7
(WRITE IN)

Ask all

Which other languages do you understand? (29)
English 1
Hindi 2
Gujarati 3
Punjabi 4
Urdu 5
Bengali 6
Other 7
(WRITE IN)

Interviewer's Assessment of Respondent's English — Do not ask (30)
Excellent/completely fluent 1
Very good 2
Not very good 3
Poor 4
None at all 5

81

B

Country of Birth (31)

Britain 1 →
India 2
Pakistan 3
Bangladesh 4
Uganda 5
Kenya 6
OTHER 7

If born in Britain (32)

(b) In what country did you live immediately before coming to Britain?

India 1
Pakistan 2
Bangladesh 3
Uganda 4
Kenya 5
OTHER 6

If Born in Britain (34)

(a) In what country were your parents born?

India 1
Pakistan 2
Bangladesh 3
Uganda 4
Kenya 5
OTHER 6

(WRITE IN)

If not born in Britain (35)

(c) How long have you lived in Britain?

Write in Year of arrival & Code 1 9

Under 5 years 1
5-9 years 2
10-14 years 3
15-19 years 4
20 years or more 5

Ask all born in East Africa (33)

(e) Do you basically regard yourself as being Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi, or East African?

Indian 1
Pakistani 2
Bangladeshi 3
East African 4
OTHER(WRITE IN) .....
..... 5

(d) How old were you when you came to Britain? (36)

Under 3 years 1
3-4 years 2
5-7 years 3
8-10 years 4
11-15 years 5
16-20 years 6
21-25 years 7
26-30 years 8
31-40 years 9
41 or over 0

Ask all:

(f) How long have your lived in Leicester? (37)

Write in year of arrival 1 9 AND CODE

Under five years 1
5-9 years 2
10-14 years 3
15-19 years 4
20 years or more 5

C. EDUCATION

Ask all

	(g) in Britain (38)	*(h) Before* (39)
None	1	1
1-2 years	2	2
3-4 yers	3	3
5-6 years	4	4
7-8 years	5	5
9-10 years	6	6
11-13 yers	7	7
14 or more	8	8

(g) How many years full-time education have you had in Britain?

(h) How many years full-time education did you have before coming to Britain?

Educational Qualifications (Code all held) (40)

Certificate of Secondary Education (CSE) 1
GCE 'O' Level 2
GCE 'A' Level 3

City & Guilds Certificate 4
ONC/ONC/HND/HNC 5
Professional qualifications (law, accountancy, etc) 6
Degree — British university 7
Degree — Overseas university 8
Other overseas qualifications 9
OTHER (WRITE IN)
..... O *
NONE. . . X

Could you tell me whether you usually, if you want to, listen to the radio:
READ OUT TIMES AND RING ONE CODE FOR EACH TIME.

	Yes	(41)	*No*
On a weekday			
Before 9.00am	1		7
Between 9.00am and 1.00pm	2		8
Between 1.00pm and 3.00pm	3		9
Between 3.00pm and 6.00pm	4		0
After 6.00pm	5		X
	Yes	(42)	*No*
On Sunday			
Before 9.00am	1		7
Between 9.00am and 1.00pm	2		8
Between 1.00pm and 3.00pm	3		9
Between 3.00pm and 6.00pm	4		0
After 6.00pm	5		X

	(43) *Yes*	*No*
On Saturday		
Before 9.00am	1	7
Between 9.00am-1.00pm	2	8
Between 1.00pm-3.00pm	3	9
Between 3.00pm-6.00pm	4	0
After 6.00pm	5	X

Introduction — START INTERVIEWING HERE

Good morning/afternoon/evening. I am from Opinion Research Centre and we are carrying out a survey in this area, about the sort of things which worry you, the sort of information you need, and how you find out about things.

Q.1. Do you think that there are any particularly serious problems for Asian families living in this area? DO NOT PROMPT. (44)

_____ 1 2 3
_____ 4 5 6
_____ 7 8 9
_____ O X Y
_____ (45)
_____ 1 2 3
_____ 4 5 6
_____ 7 8 9
_____ O X Y

Q.2a. I am going to read out some things which people have said are probelms for Asian families living in this area. Please would you tell me for each, whether you think it is:—

A serious problem
A bit of a problem
Not a problem

for *anyone* in your family?

INTERVIEWER — ROTATE THE ORDER OF ASKING THE STATEMENTS. TICK THE ONE YOU START WITH.

How much of a problem is?

i) having difficulty finding reasonable housing?

READ OUT: (46) ASK IF A PROBLEM: (47)

A serious problem 1 → (b) In what way is this a problem?
A bit of a problem 2 ..... 1 2 3
Not a problem 3 ..... 4 5 6
..... 7 8 9
..... O X Y
.....

---

ii) having difficulty finding jobs?

READ OUT: (48) ASK IF A PROBLEM: (49)

A serious problem 1 → (b) In what way is this a problem?
A bit of a problem 2 ..... 1 2 3
Not a problem 3 ..... 4 5 6
..... 7 8 9
..... O X Y
.....

iii) having nowhere for Asian people to go to meet each other?

READ OUT: (50) ASK IF A PROBLEM: (51)

A serious problem 1 → (b) In what way is this a problem?
A bit of a problem 2 ..... 1 2 3
Not a problem 3 ..... 4 5 6
..... 7 8 9
..... O X Y

---

iv) having difficulty in communicating with white people?

READ OUT: (52) ASK IF A PROBLEM: (53)

A serious problem 1 → (b) In what way is this a problem?
A bit of a problem 2 ..... 1 2 3
Not a problem 3 ..... 4 5 6
..... 7 8 9
..... O X Y

---

v) not getting enough religious teaching for young people?

READ OUT: (54) ASK IF A PROBLEM: (55)

A serious problem 1 → (b) In what way is this a problem?
A bit of a problem 2 ..... 1 2 3
..... 4 5 6
..... 7 8 9
..... O X Y

---

vi) having nowhere for young people to go to learn about their culture and background?

READ OUT: (56) ASK IF A PROBLEM: (57)

A serious problem 1 → (b) In what way is this a problem?
A bit of a problem 2 ..... 1 2 3
Not a problem 3 ..... 4 5 6
..... 7 8 9
..... O X Y

---

vii) not knowing where to go for advice about problems?

READ OUT: (58) ASK IF A PROBLEM: (59)

A serious problem 1 ┐
A bit of a problem 2 ┘ (b) In what way is this a problem? 1 2 3
Not a problem 3 ..... 4 5 6
..... 7 8 9
..... O X Y

---

viii) not having any single sex schools?

READ OUT: (60) ASK IF A PROBLEM: (61)

A serious problem 1 ┐
A bit of a problem 2 ┘ (b) In what way is this a problem? 1 2 3
Not a problem 3 ..... 4 5 6
..... 7 8 9
..... O X Y

---

ix) disagreements between parents and children?

READ OUT: (62) ASK IF A PROBLEM: (63)

A serious problem 1 ┐
A bit of a problem 2 ┘ (b) In what way is this a problem? 1 2 3
Not a problem 3 ..... 4 5 6
..... 7 8 9
..... O X Y

---

x) not having anywhere to practice your religion?

READ OUT: (64) ASK IF A PROBLEM: (65)

A serious problem 1 ┐
A bit of a problem 2 ┘ (b) In what way is this a problem? 1 2 3
Not a problem 3 ..... 4 5 6
..... 7 8 9
..... O X Y

---

xi) not having adequate English language teaching for adults?

READ OUT: (66) ASK IF A PROBLEM: (67)

A serious problem 1 ┐
A bit of a problem 2 ┘ (b) In what way is this a problem? 1 2 3
Not a problem 3 ..... 4 5 6
..... 7 8 9
..... O X Y

---

xii) not being able to find out about training opportunities for young people?

READ OUT: (68) ASK IF A PROBLEM: (69)

A serious problem 1 ┐
A bit of a problem 2 ┘ (b) In what way is this a problem? 1 2 3
Not a problem 3 ..... 4 5 6
..... 7 8 9
..... O X Y

---

xiii) not speaking English well enough?

READ OUT: (70) ASK IF A PROBLEM: (71)

A serious problem 1 ┐
A bit of a problem 2 ┘ (b) In what way is this a problem? 1 2 3
Not a problem 3 ..... 4 5 6
..... 7 8 9
..... O X Y

---

xiv) not knowing how to register to vote?

READ OUT: (72) ASK IF A PROBLEM: (73)

A serious problem 1
A bit of a problem 2 → (b) In what way is this a problem? 1 2 3
Not a problem 3 ..... 4 5 6
..... 7 8 9
..... O X Y

---

xv) not knowing the way the voting system works?

READ OUT: (74) ASK IF A PROBLEM: (75)

A serious problem 1
A bit of a problem 2 → (b) In what way is this a problem? 1 2 3
Not a problem 3 ..... 4 5 6
..... 7 8 9
..... O X Y

---

xvi) not being able to get general news about what is going on back home?

READ OUT: (76) ASK IF A PROBLEM: (77)

A serious problem 1
A bit of a problem 2 → (b) In what way is this a problem? 1 2 3
Not a problem 3 ..... 4 5 6
..... 7 8 9
..... O X Y

---

xvii) not being able to get advice about education?

READ OUT: (78) ASK IF A PROBLEM: (79)

A serious problem 1
A bit of a problem 2 → (b) In what way is this a problem? 1 2 3
Not a problem 3 ..... 4 5 6
..... 7 8 9
..... O X Y

Start card 2
Dup. cols 1-9

xviii) not knowing the way the trade union system works?

READ OUT: (10) ASK IF A PROBLEM (11)

A serious problem 1
A bit of a problem 2 → (b) In what way is this a problem? 1 2 3
Not a problem 3 ..... 4 5 6
..... 7 8 9
..... O X Y

---

xix) not being able to get advice about careers for young people?

READ OUT: (12) ASK IF A PROBLEM: (13)

A serious problem 1
A bit of a problem 2 → (b) In what way is this a problem? 1 2 3
Not a problem 3 ..... 4 5 6
..... 7 8 9
..... O X Y

---

xx) not having Asian language teaching in schools?

READ OUT: (14) ASK IF A PROBLEM: (15)

A serious problem 1
A bit of a problem 2 → (b) In what way is this a problem? 1 2 3
Not a problem 3 ..... 4 5 6
..... 7 8 9
..... O X Y

---

xxi) not knowing the customs and traditions of white people living in the area?

READ OUT: (16) ASK IF A PROBLEM: (17)

☐	A serious problem 1	(b) In what way is this a problem?	
	A bit of a problem 2	.....	1 2 3
	Not a problem 3	.....	4 5 6
		.....	7 8 9
		.....	O X Y

INTERVIEWER — REMEMBER TO GO BACK TO PAGE 4 AND ASK ALL STATEMENTS UP TO THE TICKED ONE.

Ask All

Q.3. If you were in the circumstances where you need each of the things I am going to read out, would you know how to go about getting it?

Ask for each in turn

Would you know how to go about getting:—	Would know	Would not	Not sure	
council houisng	1	2	3	
unemployment benefit	5	6	7	(18)
the Old Age Pension	8	9	0	
maternity benefit (for your wife)	1	2	3	
home improvement grants	5	6	7	(19)
sickness benefit	9	0	X	
free school meals	1	2	3	
rent or rate rebates	5	6	7	(20)
advice about taxation	9	0	X	
family income supplement	1	2	3	
advice about immigration regulations	5	6	7	(21)
widows pension	9	0	X	

Ask All

Q.4a. Would you know what to do if you thought you had been discriminated against for *housing* because of your race, colour or national or ethnic origin?

		COL CC2	ROUTE
		(22)	
	Yes	1 →	b
	No	2	Q.5
	Not sure	3	
Q.4b If Yes What would you do?		(23)	
		1 2 3	
		4 5 6	
		7 8 9	
		O X Y	Q.5

All

Q.5a Would you know what to do if you thought you had been discriminated against *for a job* because of your race, colour or national or ethnic origin?

	(24)	
Yes	1	b
No	2	Q.6
Not sure	3	

Q.5b **If Yes**
What would you do?_____ (25)

_____ 1 2 3
4 5 6
_____ 7 8 9
O X Y Q.6

Q.6. **Ask All**
Would you know what to do if your thought you had been discriminated against in any other way?

	(26)	
Yes	1	b
No	2	Q.7
Not sure	3	

Q.6b **If Yes**
What would you do?_____ (27)

_____ 1 2 3
4 5 6
_____ 7 8 9
O X Y Q.7

Q.7 Do you think that in this area discrimination on the grounds of race, or national or ethnic origin is:

	(28)	
READ OUT: ..... A serious problem	1	
..... A problem but not a serious one	4	
..... Not much of a problem	1	
..... Not a problem at all (don't know)	2	
	3	
	4	
	5	

Ask All

Q.8a Now, moving on to a slight different subject, would you tell me which newspapers you *ever* read? READ OUT PAPERS LISTED BELOW.
CODE ALL EVER READ.

Q.8b Which of these do you read regularly (that is 4 out of 5 issues)?

	EVER READ (29)	READ REGU (31)
Banglar Dak	1	1
Jagoran	2	2
Janomot	3	3
Politics	4	4
Sagar	5	5
Ame Gujerati	6	6
Garavi Gujerat	7	7
Gujerat Samachar	8	8
New Britian	9	9
Amar Deep	O	O
Madahosh	X	X
Navin Weekly	Y	Y
	(30)	(32)
Des Perdes	1	1
Punjab Times	2	2
Roopvati	3	3
Akhbar-e-Watan	4	4
Daily Jang	5	5
Mashriq	6	6
Milap	7	7
Daily Milap	8	8
Daily Millat	9	9
The People's Weekly	X	O
Azad	X	X
London Murasu	Y	Y

	EVER READ (33)
Asian Express	1
India Weekly	2
The Crusader	3
New Focus	4
New Life	5
Race Today	6
Sikh Courier	7
The Sun	8
Daily Mail	9
The Daily Mirror	O
The Times	X
The Guardian	Y
	(34)
The Daily Telegraph	1
The Financial Times	2
The Morning Star	4
Daily Express	5
Leicester Advertiser	6
Leicester Mercury	
ANY OTHER ASIAN LANGUAGE PAPERS (Write In)	7
ANY OTHER ENGLISH LANGUAGE PAPERS (Write In)	9
	O
Read no papers at all	Y

Ask All

Q.9 How many days a week do you watch television, either English or Asian Language programmes?

	(37)	
nearly every day	1	
3-5 days a week	2	Q.10
Less than 3 days	3	
Never watch	4	Q.11

Ask all who watch T.V.

Q.10 In an average week, for how many hours do you watch television?

PROBE FOR ESTIMATE

WRITE IN _____ AND CODE

	(38)	
5 hours or less	1	
Over 5 hours up to 10 hrs.	2	
Over 10 hrs. up to 15 hrs.	3	
Over 15 hrs. up to 20 hrs.	4	
Over 20 hrs. up to 25 hrs.	5	
Over 25 hrs. up to 30 hrs.	6	
Over 30 hrs. up to 40 hrs.	7	
Over 40 hrs.	8	
Can't say.	9	Q.11

Q.11 **Ask All**

How many days each week do you listen to the radio, either English or Asian language programmes?

	(39)	
Nearly every day	1	
3-5 days a week	2	Q.15
Less than 3 days	3	
Never listen	4	Q.12

Q.12. ASK ALL WHO *NEVER* LISTEN TO RADIO

Does anyone living in this household have a radio?

	COL	ROUTE
	(40)	
Yes	1	
No	2	
Don't know	3	Q.13

Q.13a ASK ALL WHO *NEVER* LISTEN TO RADIO

Have you ever heard of Radio Leicester's "Six O'clock Show"?
It used to be called the "6.15 Show".

Yes heard of	5	Q.13b
No	6	Q.14

Q.13b IF YES

Have you ever heard it on the radio?

Yes	8	
No	9	
Don't know	O	Q.14

Q.14a ASK ALL WHO *NEVER* LISTEN TO RADIO

Have you ever heard of Radio Leicester's "Milan" programme?

	(41)	
Yes heard of	1	14b
No	2	Q.26

Q.14b IF YES

Have you ever heard it on the radio?

Yes	4	SKIP
No	5	TO
Don't know	6	Q.26

Q.15a **Ask all who do listen to Radio**

During the week, Monday to Friday, for about how many hours in total do you usually listen to the radio?
PROBE FOR ESTIMATE

WRITE IN A _____ AND CODE

	(42)
3 hours or less	1
Over 3 hrs. up to 5 hrs.	2
Over 5 hrs. up to 10 hrs.	3
Over 10 hrs. up to 15 hrs.	4
Over 15 hrs. up to 20 hrs.	5
Over 20 hrs. up to 25 hrs.	6
Over 25 hrs. up to 30 hrs.	7
Over 30 hrs. up to 40 hrs.	8
Over 40 hrs.	9
Can't say	O

Q.15b And over a weekend, Saturday and Sunday, for how many hours in total do you usually listen to the radio?

		(43)
WRITE IN B _____ AND CODE	½ HOURS OR LESS	1
	Over 3 hrs. up to 5 hrs.	2
	Over 5 hrs. up to 10 hrs.	3
	Over 10 hrs. up to 15 hrs.	4
	Over 15 hrs. up to 20 hrs.	5
	Over 20 hrs. up to 25 hrs.	6
	Over 25 hrs. up to 30 hrs.	7
	Over 30 hrs. up to 40 hrs.	8
	Over 40 hrs.	9
	Can't say.	O

Q.15c That makes a total of . . . . . QUOTE TOTAL A PLUS B hours in a full week. Would you say that that is about right? IF NOT RIGHT, GO BACK TO 15a and 15b AND AMEND AS NECESSARY.

		(44)	(45)	
A + B =	WRITE IN TOTAL HOURS LISTENED TO RADIO IN A WEEK →	___	___	hours

Ask all who do listen to radio

Q.16a Which stations do you listen to most? CODE AT a BELOW, DO *NOT* READ OUT STAIONS.

Q.16b Which other stations do you sometimes listen to? CODE AT b BELOW. DO *NOT* READ OUT STATIONS.

Q.16c Which of these other stations do you ever listen to! READ OUT ALL STATIONS NOT ALREADY MENTIONED. CODE AT C BELOW.

	a	b	c
	Listen Most	Some-times Listen	Prompted
	(46)	(47)	(48)
BBC Radio 1	1	1	1
BBC Radio 2	2	2	2
BBC Radio 3	3	3	3
BBC Radio 4	4	4	4
BBC Radio Leicester	5	5	5
BBC Radio Birmingham	6	6	6
BBC Radio Derby	7	7	7
BBC Radio Nottingham	8	8	8
B.R.M.B.	9	9	9
Radio Trent	O	O	O
Other WRITE IN _____			
_____	X	X	

Q.17 **Ask all who ever listen to Radio Leicester** (Code 5 at Q.16a, b or c)
At what times of the day do you tend to listen most to Radio Leicester?

	(49)
Before 9.00 a.m.	1
9.00 a.m.-1.00p.m.	2
1.00p.m.-3.00 p.m.	3
3.00 p.m.-6.00 p.m.	4
6.00 p.m.-7.00 p.m.	5
After 7.00 p.m.	6

Q.18 ASK ALL WHO LISTEN TO RADIO
I am going to read out the names of some radio programmes, could you tell me whether you listen to it or not? (for each one)

IF LISTEN ASK
Do you listen to it regularly, or only occasionally?

EVEN DATE	Do not Listen	Listen Regularly	Listen Occasionally
Radio Leicester's Good morning Leicester (Mon-Fri 6.30-8.45 a.m.)	1	2	3
Radio Leicester Cross Talk (Mon-Fri 10.04a.m.-11.00 a.m.)	5	6	7 (50)
Radio Leicester's Right Up Your Street (Sun 10.30 a.m.-12.00 a.m.)	9	O	X
Radio Leicester's Three Till Ten (Mon-Fri 3.04 p.m.-6.00 p.m.)	1	2	3
Radio Leicester's 6.00 show (Mon, Wed, Thur & Fri 6.00 p.m.-7.00 p.m.)	5	6	7 (51)
Radio Leicester's Milan (Tuesday 6.00 p.m.-7.00 p.m.)	9	O	X
Radio Birmingham's East and West (Monday 7.20-7.50 p.m.)	1	2	3
Radio Birmingham's Garana (Tuesday 7.20-7.50 p.m.)	5	6	7 (52)
*Radio Birmingham's Apna Hi Ghar Samajhiye (Friday 7.45-8.15 p.m.)	9	O	X
Radio Derby's Sangam (Thur. 6.40-7.30 p.m.)	1	2	3
Radio Nottingham's Nawrang (Friday 7.30-9.00 p.m.)	5	6	7 (53)
B.R.M.B.'s Geet Mala (Sunday 8.30-10.00 p.m.)	9	O	X
*Radio 4's Apna Hi Ghar Samajhiye (Sunday 7.15-7.45 a.m.)	1	2	3

ODD DATE

*These are in fact the same programme. Probe to find out the time it is heard to make sure respondents are assigning it to the correct station.

INTERVIEWER — YOU NOW HAVE TO ASK Q.19-Q.23 FOR EACH PROGRAMME LISTENED TO.

—IF DATE OF INTERVIEW IS EVEN NUMBER, WORK FROM TOP TO BOTTOM.

—IF DATE OF INTERVIEW IS ODD NUMBER WORK FROM BOTTOM TO TOP.

Ask Q.19—Q.23 for each programme listened to.
WRITE IN NAME OF PROGRAMME CLEARLY

	A	B	C	D
Q.19 What do you think of ..... QUOTE NAME OF PROGRAMME—PROBE DO NOT PROMPT	(55)	(61)	(67)	(73)
	(56)	(62)	(68)	(74)
Content good/interesting	1	1	1	1
Well made/good quality	2	2	2	2
Interesting/useful information for local community	3	3	3	3
Like the songs	4	4	4	4
Like the news items/covers news	5	5	5	5
Is in the right language(s)	6	6	6	6
Entertaining/amusing/enjoyable	7	7	7	7
Too much talking	8	8	8	8
Too many songs	9	9	9	9
Do not like the songs	0	0	0	0
Poor quality/not professional	X	X	X	X
Language wrong/can't understand	Y	Y	Y	Y
(57)	(57)	(63)	(69)	(75)
Should be in:(DO NOT PROMPT)				
Hindi	1	1	1	1
Gujarati	2	2	2	2
Punjabi	3	3	3	3
Urdu	4	4	4	4
Bengali	5	5	5	5
Hindi-Urdu/Hindustani	6	6	6	6
News not interesting/not relevant	7	7	7	7
Should have news of India/Pakistan/Bangladesh	8	8	8	8
Too narrow range of topics	9	9	9	9
Other comments 6write in and ring letter	OFFICE USE ONLY			
IN APPROPRIATE COLUMN TO IDENTIFY PROGRAMME REFERRED TO)	(58) (59)	(64) (65)	(70) (71)	(76) (77)
A _____	A			
B _____		B		
C _____			C	
D _____				D

I think these will have to be cut off to size or whatever they are after...

Q.20 What do you think of the time that it is on?	(60)	(66)	(72)	(78)
Suitable/convenient/right time	1	1	1	1
Too early	2	2	2	2
Too late	3	3	3	3
Too short/not long enough	4	4	4	4
It does not matter what time it is on	5	5	5	5
Other comments (WRITE IN)				
A	A			
B		B		
C			C	
D				D

Q.21 What do you think of the subjects (QUOTE PROGRAMME) is about?	A (10)	B (16)	C (22)	D (28)
Interesting	1	1	1	1
Useful/informative to the Asian community	2	2	2	2
Gives useful information (general)	3	3	3	3
Entertaining/amusing	4	4	4	4
Not interesting/relevant to the Asian community	5	5	5	5
Out of date	6	6	6	6
Other comments (WRITE IN)	(11)	(17)	(23)	(29)
A	A			
B		B		
C			C	
D				D

Q.22 Can you think of any subjects (QUOTE PROGRAMME) should cover but does not?	(12)	(18)	(24)	(30)
None/nothing/OK as it is/can't think of anything	1	1	1	1
Asian classical music	2	2	2	2
Asian popular music	3	3	3	3
More music (either type)	4	4	4	4
Entertainment	5	5	5	5
Stories/plays	6	6	6	6
Quizzes/competitions	7	7	7	7
Local happenings/events	8	8	8	8
Local affairs/news	9	9	9	9
News from India/Pakistan/Bangladesh	0	0	0	0
National (British) News	X	X	X	X
Religion/religious teaching	Y	Y	Y	Y
	(13)	(19)	(25)	(31)
Religion for young people/young Asians	1	1	1	1
Asian language teaching	2	2	2	2
Asian culture	3	3	3	3
Information for young Asians on Asian culture etc.	4	4	4	4
Discussions (general)	5	5	5	5
Views of young people (general)	6	6	6	6
Views of young Asians	7	7	7	7
Citizens rights/advice on problems	8	8	8	8
Anti-discrimination laws	9	9	9	9
	(14)	(20)	(26)	(32)

Other comments (WRITE IN)				
A	A			
B		B		
C				
D				D

Q.23 Do you think that ..... (QUOTE PROGRAMME) is mainly meant to be:	(15)	(21)	(27)	(33)
Read out:- Entertainment, or	1	1	1	1
Educational & informative	2	2	2	2
Other (SPONTANEOUS) WRITE IN				
A	A			
B		B		
C			C	

Repeat Q.19—Q.23 for next programme listened to. If more than four programmes listened to use a pink sheet to record details of fifth and subsequent.

ASK ALL WHO LISTEN TO RADIO LEICESTER'S MILAN AND/OR SIX O'CLOCK SHOW.

		(34)
Q.24a Since you first heard 'Milan/the 6 O'clock show' on Radio Leicester have you taken to listening to any other Radio Leicester programmes?	Yes	1
	No	2
Q.24b When 'Milan/the 6 O'clock show' has finished do you:		
Read out:		
..... switch off the radio		4
..... retune to another station		5
..... or go on listening		6
(it varies/depends)		7

Ask Q.25 FOR EACH **RADIO LEICESTER** PROGRAMME *NOT* LISTENED TO.				
WRITE IN NAME OF PROGRAMME →				
Q.25a Have you ever heard of..... (QUOTE PROGRAMME)	(35)	(39)	(43)	(47)
	(36)	(40)	(44)	(48)
Yes	1	1	1	1
No	2	2	2	2
Not sure	3	3	3	3
IF YES				

Q.25b Why do you *not* listen to it?

Am at work/school then	5	5	5	5
Am busy elsewhere then	6	6	6	6
Am asleep/in bed then	7	7	7	7
Other reasons why time not convenient	8	8	8	8
Already heard programme	9	9	9	9
Listen to other stations	0	0	0	0
Don't like songs/too many songs	X	X	X	X
Not enough songs/music	Y	Y	Y	Y
	(37)	(41)	(45)	(49)
Too much talk/information	1	1	1	1
Boring/repetitive	2	2	2	2
Not relevant to Asians	3	3	3	3
Not relevant to this area/no local news	4	4	4	4
Not interested in Asian programme	5	5	5	5
Other comments (WRITE IN)	(38)	(42)	(46)	(50)
_____	- -			
_____	- -	- -		
_____	- -	- -	- -	
_____	- -	- -	- -	-

ASK ALL WHO EVER WATCH TELEVISION

Q.26 What are your favourite television programmes? PROBLE TO GET *SIX* PROGRAMMES. — DO NOT PROMPT

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____
6. _____

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

(51)	(52)	(53)
1 2 3	1 2 3	1 2 3
4 5 6	4 5 6	4 5 6
7 8 9	7 8 9	7 8 9
O X Y	O X Y	O X Y

INTERVIEWER—ALL WHO NEVER WATCH TELEVISION ASK Q.27

Ask all not mentioning Nai Zindagi Naya Jeevan

Q.27a Have you ever heard of the Asian programme Nai Zindagi Naya Jeevan!

	(54) COL	
Yes	1	Q.27b
No	2	
Not sure	3	Q.35

If Yes

Q.27b Do you ever watch it?

Yes	5	Q.29
No	6	Q.28

Ask all who do not watch Nai Zindagi Naya Jeevan

Q.28 Why do you not watch it?

	(55)
Am at work/school then	1
Am busy elsewhere then	2
Am asleep/in bed then	3
Other reasons why time not convenient	4
Prefer other programmes	5
Don't like songs/too many songs	6

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 185 207 UD 020 489

AUTHOR Rossell, Christine H.
TITLE Social Science Research in School Desegregation Cases: A Critical Review.
PUB DATE Apr 80
NOTE 59p.; Paper prepared for the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Boston, MA, April 7-11, 1980)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Courts; *Desegregation Litigation; Equal Education; Equal Protection; *School Desegregation; *Social Science Research
IDENTIFIERS Evidence; Social Justice

ABSTRACT

Because educational equity is a developing area, courts have little precedent to guide rulings. Extra-legal evidence may help in deciding what the law is. Social science evidence is also invited by the courts because educational equity law is purportedly an instrument of social change. The sophistication of social science research, as well as the qualifications of testifying experts, varies greatly. Some confusions about the role of social science in court cases may result from the fact that the bulk of expert testimony is contributed by educational practitioners drawing conclusions and making inferences rather than by social scientists testifying about their research findings. Social science has influenced the development of educational equity law by identifying and clarifying important issues, by providing consensual factual information, and by instructing the courts on how to analyze the salient issues. Legal opinions often indicate that the courts have adopted the social science mode of reasoning and the findings that follow and have chosen one social science claim over another. Even when social science research merely corroborates a judge's priori preference, such evidence can still influence a decision. In some cases, social science may provide the court with the necessary intellectual justification for a decision that cannot be justified only on legal grounds. (Author/MK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

APR 1 7 1980

SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH IN SCHOOL DESEGREGATION CASES:

A CRITICAL REVIEW

ED185207

Christine H. Rossell

Political Science Department
Boston University

Prepared for delivery at the American Educational Research Association annual meeting, Boston, Mass., April 7-11, 1980

UD020489

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Christine H. Rossell

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH IN SCHOOL DESEGREGATION CASES: A CRITICAL REVIEW

I.

INTRODUCTION

Social science data was formally introduced into the judicial arena in 1908 by Louis Brandeis in Muller v. Oregon. Brandeis filed a 113 page brief consisting of two pages of legal opinion and 111 pages of survey data, governmental statistics, and the opinions of doctors, employers, and employees concerning the reaction of women to contemporary working conditions. This vast array of evidence indicated that women could not tolerate the same working conditions as men. Since that time, a trial brief which relies on social data has been called a "Brandeis" brief, and this style of litigation, "sociological jurisprudence." It was not until the public school desegregation cases of the 1950s, however, that academic social scientists were called upon in large numbers to present data in the judicial arena, and it is only in the last few years that the influence of social science on the law has become a matter of interest to social scientists themselves.

What is Social Science?

This paper in broad terms discusses the kinds of knowledge, uses of knowledge, and users of knowledge involved in educational equity cases. The kinds of knowledge used in these cases are legal information, social science research, and the opinions of social scientists, educators, psychologists, and others. It is important to define social science research at the outset. It is the thesis of this paper that much of what is called social science by lawyers and judges is, by the standards of the social science discipline,

nothing of the sort. Judge Craven describes William S. Smith, Doctor of Divinity and President of Randolph Macon College, as a social scientist, although his contribution to Scott v. Sandford (1856) consisted only of a copy of his lectures entitled The Philosophy and Practice of Slavery, arguing that "domestic slavery is not sinful and that slavery... is a fundamental principle of the social state," (Craven, 1975). Similarly, Judge McMillan, the author of Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education (1969) defines social science as "the study of human society, the interaction of individuals in and with groups, and the welfare of people in society," (McMillan, 1975). I believe both of the definitions implied here are in error as to what social science is and what social science research is.

Social science is a discipline which employs an accepted set of empirical, "scientific" methods in order to formulate universal or general laws which allow us to understand and predict human behavior. The scientific methods used by social scientists are intended to maximize objectivity, reliability, and generalizability. The concept of a control group, or of variation in the cause and effect variables across cases, is critical to the scientific study of any phenomena. Two other important aspects of the scientific method are sampling theory which provides guidelines for the selection of subject/respondents so that a researcher does not merely select those subjects which will verify his or her hypotheses, and statistical theory which provides the basis for the systematic acceptance of hypotheses.

We can exclude from the field of social science the study of particular cases for the purposes of understanding them in some way as in psychiatry, clinical psychology, history, law, accounting, educational administration,

business administration, and social work. We can also exclude those aspects of political science, sociology, philosophy, psychology, anthropology, and economics which do not use scientific methods, but attempt to make generalizations based on intuition, common sense, or nonsystematic observation.

Nevertheless, the fields I would exclude from the social science discipline have been used extensively in expert testimony in court cases, and hence may have led to some misunderstanding as to the role of the social sciences in the judicial arena. Although an expert witness may have gained his reputation on the basis of his social science research, unless he adheres closely to the conclusions which can be drawn from the research, he is not acting as a social scientist.

Dworkin (1977) makes a distinction between two kinds of judgements or hypotheses, both of which he argues belong to the social sciences in the sense that they are made by people who profess to be members of some discipline called social science. The first, causal judgements, are judgements that assert a causal connection between two independently specifiable social phenomena. The example used by Dworkin is the finding that as unemployment increases, inflation decreases. Another example (from school desegregation research) is that the greater the proportion of whites reassigned to black schools, the greater the white enrollment loss. These predictions are generated by social science research which adheres to the standards discussed above.

The second type of judgements made by social scientists are called interpretive judgements because they do not assert a causal relationship between two independent and specifiable phenomena, but rather locate a particular phenomenon within a particular category of phenomena by identifying

its meaning within the society in which it occurs. Although Dworkin uses an example drawn from anthropology, it might be more useful to use one drawn from an educational court case. In Milliken v. Bradley (1974), Karl Taeuber presented extensive material on residential segregation and its causes. The demographic analyses show 1) that there is extensive segregation by race, and 2) that less than half that segregation can be explained by income constraints. Other studies (Pettigrew, 1973; Duncan, Schuman, and Duncan, 1973; Farley, et al., 1978) show that most blacks prefer integrated housing. None of the research, however, empirically demonstrates that discrimination is the cause of the segregation of blacks from whites, and yet that is precisely the information that is needed by the Court. Hence when Taeuber testifies that in his judgement the fifty percent of segregation which is unexplained by income or choice is probably due to discrimination, he is making what Dworkin calls an interpretive judgement.

I believe that Dworkin's distinction is a useful one, but that he is mistaken in his utility ranking of these two types of judgements. He writes that because causal judgements in the social sciences rest on an arcane subject, namely statistics, and interpretive judgements draw on a technology that is not foreign to the judge, the latter is more enduring and less troublesome. He writes "... interpretive judgements study society and its practices in the same way that ordinary judgements of adjudication -- the kind of judgements judges make in hard cases all the time -- study standard legal materials. This distinction, then -- between causal and interpretive judgements -- gives us a kind of functional analysis of why the causal judgements of social science create problems in the judicial process,

but why interpretive judgements are native to that process" (Dworkin, 1977: 24).

I would argue exactly the opposite, and I believe I would have the support of most of my colleagues in the social sciences. It is the interpretive judgements that get social science and social scientists into trouble, and it is the causal judgements, resting as they do on accepted social science techniques, that make the most useful contribution to court decisions. Causal judgements, of course, involve some interpretation in order to transform correlation into causation, but as long as the method used to determine the correlation is a respected one, the correlation -- the major part of the judgement -- can be reanalyzed and refuted. It is much more difficult to refute interpretive judgements, if it can be done at all.

I would also place most statistical criticism in the category of interpretive judgement. My own experience has been that social scientists are very influenced by their own personal ideologies or viewpoints in their statistical criticisms unless they are forced to adhere to the standards of social science by demonstrating empirically that correcting the flaw would change the findings of the study. (Usually it doesn't.) Hence, I disagree with both Wolf (1976) and Katz (1971) when they argue that the most useful role of social science is to identify the logical fallacies, contradictory and inaccurate premises, faulty or inadequate techniques of research design, or confused reasoning employed by decision-makers in arriving at their views of the causal factors responsible for situations defined by them as problematic and in need of governmental intervention. In general, social scientists are no more able to be objective in their criticisms than are

knowledgeable policymakers, lawyers, and judges. In fact, the only place where social scientists are capable of objective analysis is in the conduct of their research if they adhere to the scientific standards of comparison, random sampling and statistical criterion of significance, and the research is basically quantitative.

A Framework for Understanding Educational Equity Court Cases

A majority of all court decisions on educational issues in the last two decades involve, in one way or another, alleged violations of equal educational opportunity. As an abstract principle, equal educational opportunity seems to be highly valued, but in practice there appears to be no consensus as to what it means. Yudof (1973) cites three definitions: 1) every child must have equal access to schooling resources (equal dollars or equal facilities and services) unless a compelling state interest has been demonstrated to the contrary; 2) all public school students, regardless of race or ethnic origin, must be treated in a nondiscriminatory manner; and 3) inequalities among individuals in the effectiveness of resources and the outcomes of schooling must be compensated for by the state. The courts have generally disregarded this last definition, and at different times adopted the first two definitions.

The two major categories of violations of equal educational opportunity are racial segregation and resource distribution. Violations of equal educational opportunity through unequal resource distribution include: 1) individual discrimination in the availability of educational services -- i.e. the exclusion of students for disciplinary reasons, the failure to provide education in the student's language, the failure to provide education for the handicapped, and excluding students from the regular curriculum or

high status curriculum by testing and tracking; and 2) unequal distribution of financial resources resulting in intradistrict racial disparities (e.g. Hobson v. Hansen) or interdistrict income or class disparities (e.g. Rodriguez v. San Antonio School District). All such cases involve two parts: the determination of the violation and the determination of the remedy.

There appears to be no consistent or coherent principle which would justify the court decisions on equal educational opportunity. In many of the early desegregation decisions and in some of the most recent state court decisions, the remedial principle of individual protection seems to have been the determining factor. That is to say, intentional discrimination is the violation, and nondiscrimination the remedy. Later court decisions, however, seemed often to be conforming to what Yudof (1978) calls the group protection principle (earlier called the universalistic ethic in Yudof, 1973). This principle has as its goal the complete integration of any disadvantaged group into the mainstream of society by whatever means is necessary to accomplish this, regardless of the extent of intentional violation which can be proved. Rather than enunciating this principle, however, the courts have simply behaved as if they were abiding by it in most equal educational opportunity decisions between 1968 and 1974. Recently, they appear to be returning to the remedial principle. The outcome of this contradiction between statements and behavior, prior decisions and later decisions, is a decline in respect for legal decisions-makers and legal decisions.

This is a possible motivation for lawyers to introduce voluminous social science research and expert testimony into educational equity cases. If there is no general principle guiding a lawmaker's decisions then it is quite possible

that he or she may indeed be influenced by "social science facts." Another theory as to why voluminous social science research is introduced into educational equity cases, offered by Leubsdorf (1978), is that when courts make decisions which are instruments of social or personal change they invite empirical evidence on whether their orders can really accomplish these ends.

It is the thesis of this paper that social science research has played an important role in the development of school desegregation law. It has done so by identifying and clarifying the important issues in the resolution of social equity disputes and by instructing the Court on how to analyze these issues. Because conflicting research findings are typically presented by opposing sides, court decisions rarely cite social science testimony and often claim it to be irrelevant to their decisions. Judges do not mind choosing sides when presented with conflicting legal facts, but they are often reluctant to do so openly where conflicting social science research is concerned. Nevertheless, the structure and the causal assumptions usually asserted in school desegregation opinions indicate the Court has, consciously or unconsciously, adopted the mode of reasoning of social science and the findings which would follow from that.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF SCHOOL DESEGREGATION LAW

Southern De Jure Segregation: Determining the Violation, 1896-1964

In order for racial segregation in the public schools to be a violation of the 14th Amendment, it has to be viewed as harmful to blacks. Prior to 1950, that was not the case. Justice Brown wrote in Plessy v. Ferguson (1896):

> We consider the underlying fallacy of the plaintiff's argument to consist in the assumption that the enforced separation of the two races stamps the colored race with a badge of inferiority. If this be so, it is not by reason of anything found in the act, but solely because the colored race chooses to put that construction on it.

Justice Harlan's dissent cut through Brown's suggestion that nothing malevolent was implied in the segregation law, but three years later Harlan wrote the majority opinion in Cumming v. Richmond County Board of Education (1899) upholding the right of the school board to segregate blacks from whites even when that resulted in the black children having no school. Harlan wrote: "... any interference on the part of the Federal authority with the management of such schools cannot be justified except in the case of a clear and unmistakable disregard of rights secured by the supreme law of the land. We have no such case to be determined." This was upheld again in Gong Lum v. Rice (1927).

The lack of harmfulness of racial segregation in the public schools was thus well established and consistently upheld through the first half

of the 20th century. New evidence was needed to convince lawmakers that prior courts had been mistaken and that racial segregation was in fact harmful. Most legal scholars argue that social science research did not provide this. They contend, rather, that the harmfulness of segregation was simply an idea whose time had come. World War II was the first war in which black Americans fought in large numbers. They then returned home to a segregated society that degraded and stigmatized them even though they had only recently risked their lives "to make the world free for democracy." Furthermore, a caste system was incompatible with an increasingly industrial society. These trends do not, however, establish the harm of segregation, nor preclude the possibility that social science research was important both in creating a climate of opinion, and in influencing legal decisions in specific court cases in which it was introduced.

The first recorded use of social science findings in educational equity cases was not in Brown v. Board of Education (1954), but in Sweatt v. Painter (1950), the Texas law school case. The case against school segregation as both scientifically unjustifiable and socially destructive (and hence a 14th Amendment violation) rested on the testimony of an anthropologist, Professor Robert Redfield, chairman of the department of anthropology at the University of Chicago. Redfield's testimony, as it is reported by Kluger (1975), appears to be only slightly more scientific than William A. Smith's philosophy lectures some 100 years earlier. Nevertheless, it was impressive. The court opinion in Sweatt stated that this was the first trial record containing expert testimony and other "convincing evidence" showing the lack of any reasonable basis for racial segregation at the professional school level, its inherent inequality and its effect on the

students, the school, and the state. Coincidentally, this was the first time a black applicant was ordered admitted to a white professional school although the Court steadfastly maintained (as almost all later courts were to do) that it had not been influenced by the social science testimony. They claimed the decision was made solely on the basis of the fact that the University of Texas law school was clearly superior to any other law school in the state. Hence, denying entrance to a black would relegate him to an inferior education.

As reasonable as this may sound to a legal scholar (and they all seem to believe it), it is perplexing to a social scientist because it leaves unanswered the question of why the social science evidence was introduced in the first place (was Thurgood Marshall a fool?), why justices disagree in their opinions (if facts are so obvious that would not happen), and why no earlier court had ordered such a radical remedy -- integration -- on the basis of the obvious fact that any state supported white professional school was bound to be superior to a black professional school.

It is possible that the confusion among legal scholars and lawmakers as to the influence of social science evidence stems from their unwillingness to acknowledge extra-rational (or social psychological) influences on one's perception of the facts. The social science testimony presented in Sweatt was not really germane to the issue of whether the white professional school was superior to the black professional school, and that is what the decision presumably turned on. Nevertheless, the evidence that segregation was harmful and that blacks were equal to whites motivated the Court to see the "obvious facts" which no earlier court had recognized. The social science testimony reassured them that their conclusion was intellectually and

politically respectable.

Perhaps no case has generated more controversy with regard to the proper role of social science research in court cases than Brown v. Board of Education (1954). From 1951 to 1954, more than forty psychologists, psychiatrists, educators and sociologists appeared before the trial courts as expert witnesses in three of the four school desegregation cases decided as Brown v. Board of Education (Brown v. Board of Education, on appeal from the Kansas federal district court; Briggs v. Elliott, on appeal from a federal district court in South Carolina; Davis v. County School Board, on appeal from a federal district court in Virginia; Gebhart v. Belton, on cert. to the Supreme Court of Delaware) and Bolling v. Sharpe, on cert. to the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, decided separately .

The social science testimony in these cases filled four volumes of the record, yet only a few legal scholars and judges believe it had any but the most trivial influence on the court decision. One exception is Fiss (1975) who advocates what is called the sociological interpretation of Brown. He argues that the constitutional case against racially imbalanced schools must rest on a claim that the educational opportunities afforded black children attending such schools is unequal to that afforded children attending other public schools. Social science research is necessary to determine this harm.

Most legal scholars and lawyers dispute this, and argue as Cahn (1955) does that the social science testimony was unnecessary because the issue was a matter of common sense -- we know that segregation is an insult to

the black community the way we know that fire burns and that colds cause the sniffles. This argument is especially weak on two grounds. First, if we know it in a common sense way, why did we not know it prior to 1954? Second, after almost four decades of social science research in the field of education, it should be clear that virtually nothing about the educational process is self-evident.

Given that most legal scholars and judges believe that the social science research had no effect on the court's decision, the question of its quality, by social science standards, may be irrelevant. Nevertheless, that too generated a debate of a vitriolic nature only achieved in a few instances since then.

Much of the criticism of the social science research in the Brown cases centered on Kenneth Clark's doll studies which were introduced into evidence through Clark's testimony in the South Carolina, Delaware, and Virginia cases. The studies purported to demonstrate black children suffered psychological damage from school segregation by demonstrating that black children tend to choose white dolls over black dolls as "nice" dolls, as well as dolls that resemble themselves. The defendants' attorney in the South Carolina case, John W. Davis, revealed that Clark had only presented the findings from half of his study. The complete study (1947) included a northern sample of black children in supposedly desegregated schools in Springfield, Massachusetts. The northern control group (i.e. not in segregated schools) actually showed greater psychological damage than the southern segregated students in that they were more likely to identify the white doll as the "nice" doll.

Most commentators believe this point is devastating to Clark's case.

In terms of its impact on the Court, however, it was probably balanced by the fact that the defendant's expert witness in the Virginia case admitted under cross-examination that racial segregation in the schools does injure black children's personalities (see Cahn, 1956: 160; Kluger, 1975: 500-504).

The fact that the northern desegregated black children showed more cross race preference than the southern segregated blacks indicates something, but not, as van den Haag (1960) argues, that segregation is less harmful to blacks than desegregation. The lack of a theory can often lead to such bizarre conclusions. It seems logical to conclude not that segregation benefits blacks and desegregation harms them, but that the causal variable affecting black cross-race preference is the stigma attached to being black, not segregation per se. Nevertheless, to say that segregation is not the causal variable is different from saying it is unimportant. That would be committing the partialling fallacy. It is quite possible to have stigma without segregation, but is it possible to have segregation without stigma when we know that the cause of segregation is the unwillingness of whites to have close, intimate contact with any more than a token number of blacks (Farley, 1978)? The elimination of segregation would seem to be a necessary, but not a sufficient condition for removing the stigma attached to being black in our society.

Although Clark may have mistakenly focused on the intervening variable, rather than the independent variable, the basic validity of the doll studies as indicators of the stigma attached to being black is corroborated by research (Winnick and Taylor, 1977) which shows that today only 36 percent of black children demonstrate cross-race preference in a variety of choice

situations (including dolls), whereas in Clark's original study (1939) it was 68 percent. Accompanying this decline in cross-race preference has been a decline in prejudiced attitudes toward blacks, as well as a decline in segregation in every phase of life. In short, as the stigma attached to being black has declined, more black children have been willing to select a black doll as "nice" or exhibit the same-race preferences in other choice situations. Hence, while Clark's studies were lacking some methodological rigor which would have increased our confidence in them, Clark's conclusions were basically correct. Had Clark's critics been required to demonstrate their assertions empirically, they undoubtedly would have withdrawn them.

A statement formally titled, "The Effects of Segregation and the Consequences of Desegregation: A Social Science Statement," was intended to summarize the plaintiff's testimony although only a handful of the 32 social scientists who signed had actually testified in the trial cases.[1] Written by Clark, Isidor Chein, and Stuart Cook, the 4,000 word statement was characterized by what Cahn (1955) calls a literary format in style, rather than in substance. In fact Myrdal was the only authority to be cited in the text itself. All other authorities were cited in 35 footnotes which, from their titles and authors alone, suggested there was an extensive body of rigorous social science research supporting the three basic contentions of the plaintiffs that black and white children's intelligence differences are primarily, if not completely, environmentally caused; that segregation and presumably school segregation, was harmful to black children; and that desegregation can be carried out without violence.

Although much has been made of the fact that the social science statement was not cited by the Court, Clark (1959) points out that all but one of the

five references cited in footnote 11 of the court's opinion were references in the statement. The one reference not listed in the social science statement included a summary of Clark's White House conference manuscript (1950).

While Clark's doll studies bore the brunt of the criticism directed at the social science research, they were probably some of the more methodologically rigorous studies cited in the social science statement. The weakest study, backed up by the live testimony of Chein, is the 1948 survey of 512 anthropologists, psychologists, and sociologists conducted by Deutscher and Chein.

Deutscher and Chein were attempting to use as evidence the opinions of knowledgeable social scientists to determine the harmful effects of enforced segregation, even if equal facilities were provided. Miller and Kavanagh (1975) correctly note that the authors were violating a basic assumption of social science research when they relied on authority as the basis for determining their conclusions. According to the standards of social science, the opinions of other social scientists can be used only to develop hypotheses to be empirically tested. To use them as evidence of an empirical finding is to commit the fallacy of affirming the consequent. It is instructive to note that this so-called study, the worst of the dozens cited in the social science statement, is one of the five noted in footnote 11 of the Supreme Court decision in Brown. In doing so, the Court demonstrated its preference for expert opinion, rather than social science research.

Brown was not the last time that social science testimony on the reasonableness of race as a classification was introduced into a court case

or cited in a trial. Wisdom (1975) describes how in Stell v. Savannah-Chatham County Board of Education (1963) intervenor defendants (parents of the white children) introduced testimony and studies of several social scientists (including Dr. Henry Garrett, Kenneth Clark's professor at Columbia) to the effect that it would be educationally harmful to black children from disadvantaged environments to be forced into competition with white children. Although the plaintiffs argued such testimony was irrelevant, the District Judge held that the factual nature of the finding of injury through segregation in Brown opened the door to the intervenors' proof (220 F. Supp. at 678). The Court found for the intervenor defendants. The Fifth Circuit overturned this decision and reprimanded the judge for abuse of his discretionary powers.

In a similar case, Evers v. Jackson Municipal Separate School District (1964), the District Judge permitted evidence to be introduced to show that separate schools were not injurious, but instead were advantageous to pupils of both races. This testimony included that of seven "distinguished" scientists regarding the existence of differences between the two races in IQ, cranial capacity, and brain size which would constitute a rational basis for separate schooling. Evidence was also introduced that school integration was injurious. The District Judge expressed his belief in the validity of this evidence and argued that it called for a reconsideration of the findings in the Brown decision. He nevertheless upheld the plaintiffs motion for an injunction simply on the basis of precedent (232 F. Supp. at 244-255).

The importance of this case is that Judge Wisdom, speaking for the Fifth Circuit on appeal, firmly rejected any further attempts to overturn

Brown on a factual showing, declaring that the inherent inequality of segregated schools was now a legal principle no longer open to question (357 F. 2d). Since that time, although attorneys for the defendants have continued to submit evidence on this point, the courts have consistently disallowed such evidence. Hence by 1964, the harm of segregation and its inherent violation of the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment was an established legal principle which could not be contradicted by social science evidence, although it had been established, at least in part, by social science evidence.

Determining the Remedy, 1970-1972

While social science testimony on the reasonableness of race as a classification device was never again admitted into evidence, social science research relevant to the appropriate remedy began to play an important, and eventually a critical, role in court decisions. Indeed, most commentators believe that the most useful role social science can play is during the remedy stage because the courts are not equipped to draw up a desegregation plan sensitive to educational issues and policy questions (Yudof, 1973, 1978; Levin and Moise, 1975; Wisdom, 1975; Doyle, 1977).

In this section, I will discuss the first school segregation cases in which social science played a role in devising a remedy. This occurred during the period from 1970 to 1972 in the South when the courts were moving away from allowing open enrollment and the rescinding of the state law to suffice for a remedy, and moving toward affirmative desegregation, and ultimately racial balance. One of the first remedy disputes in which social scientists played an important role was the determination of a "viable racial mix." The debate centered on the determinants of white flight,

and the educational consequences for minority students.

In Brewer v. School Board of the City of Norfolk (1970) the district court had, in a manner similar to earlier courts, ruled that testimony from experts in education, social sciences, and psychology was appropriate because it had provided the basis for the Brown Court's repudiation of Plessy v. Ferguson (1896). The Court heard testimony on the educational benefits of a particular racial mix from Thomas Pettigrew, a Harvard University social psychologist who largely based his conclusions on the findings of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights 1967 reanalysis of the Coleman Report (1965). The research evidence from that study suggests that all children perform best in middle-class schools. Pettigrew went on to testify that educational achievement would be maximized in schools with a 70-30 ratio of white to black students.

Pettigrew's testimony regarding the exact racial proportion is probably the least defensible aspect. Neither the Coleman Report (1965) nor the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (1967) study convincingly demonstrate that 70-30 is the correct mixture to maximize benefits. Indeed, to the present day there is no solid social science evidence as to what the optimum mix is with regard to educational benefits.

Nevertheless, the Court relied heavily on this part of Pettigrew's testimony when it concluded 1) that integration was educationally beneficial only where white students were in the overwhelming majority in a student body, and 2) accepted the school district's plan which left 76 percent of the black students in all-black schools in order to achieve a 70-30 mix in the desegregated schools. The district court saw the choice as one between a system in which every school was inferior because it was majority black

and one in which some schools were superior and the rest not demonstrably worse than they would have been under a more extensive plan (see Yudof, 1973).

The Fourth Circuit reversed the district court's order without evaluating the expert testimony or questioning its admissability. Yudof (1973) sees the Fourth Circuit's disregard of the social science testimony as evidence for the Court's independence from social science research. It seems, however, that this independence, if it does exists, does not extend to the trial court where live testimony is presented.

In Brunson v. Board of Trustees of School District No. 1 of Clarendon County (1970), the Fourth Circuit directly confronted the issue of white flight and its educational consequences. In separate opinions by Judges Craven and Sobeloff, the relevance of such testimony as that of Professor Pettigrew was hotly debated, with Sobeloff arguing in the majority that social science evidence on optimal racial mixes was both irrelevant and implicitly racist because it assumes white children are a precious resource to be fairly apportioned.

Pettigrew's contention that 70-30 was the most viable racial mix was introduced again in Bradley v. School Board of the City of Richmond (1972). The Richmond city school district, over 70 percent black, proposed a metropolitan plan merging the city school system with two surrounding county school systems (Henrico and Chesterfield) over 90 percent white. The Court, convinced by Pettigrew's argument, ordered the three school systems merged in order to obtain a "viable racial mix" of at least 70 percent white in every school. It did not require proof either that the county boundaries had been intentionally drawn so as to maintain school segregation or that the counties had acted in such a way as to be responsible for the city's school segregation (338 F. Supp. at 100). The metropolitan plan was ordered solely because the social science testimony indicated such a plan would maximize the educational and social benefits of

school desegregation.

Relating the Remedy to the Violation

The Richmond case marks the beginning of the introduction of social science housing segregation research in determining the scope of the remedy. This line of inquiry was important in determining a remedy not only in metropolitan desegregation proposals, but in northern "de facto" cases and southern, second generation, de jure cases as well.

In the face of a lack of evidence of intentional school segregation on the part of the suburban county school districts, the plaintiffs in the Richmond case called Karl Taeuber, a demographer from the University of Wisconsin, to show that the counties were indirectly responsible for the city's school segregation because they contributed to housing segregation. Proving the counties' culpability depends on demonstrating that housing segregation is the result of intentional discrimination. One can only infer, however, that the unexplained portion of the variance in Taeuber's racial segregation equations is due to discrimination. In fact, there are respected sociologists who believe, on the basis of their analysis of white ethnic segregation in northern cities and their interpretation of opinion surveys, that a good part of racial and ethnic residential segregation is due to an individual's preference to have most of his neighbors be of the same race or ethnicity (Kantrowitz, 1976; Wolf, 1980).

The Fourth Circuit may have understood that Taeuber was making an educated guess, because they concluded in their opinion that the root causes of the concentration of blacks in the inner cities of America are not known and thus the district court could not realistically hold the counties

responsible for it. Judge Craven (1975), one of the authors of that opinion argues, "if it is so perfectly clear that restrictive racial covenants and discriminatory housing policies created the ghetto, whether in New York or Boston or Richmond, why is it that years after Shelly v. Kraemer (1948) and reported changes in such policies, the ghettos remain virtually intact?" To a political scientist, this seems like a terribly naive question, but by the same token social science research has not provided an unequivocal answer which would satisfy a skeptical court. The web of discriminatory housing policies and individual actions, and the social patterns they produce are simply too complex to be untangled by scientific analysis given the state of the art to date.

Determining the Violation: Northern De Facto-De Jure Segregation, 1973-1979

Most of the court action occurred in the South until the early 1970's if for no other reason than that the existence of a state law mandating racial segregation made the cases relatively easy to win compared to the North. There were some early attempts in Springfield, Massachusetts, Gary, Indiana and Cincinnati, Ohio to have de facto segregation declared unconstitutional, but these proved fruitless. The result is that in the North, plaintiffs bringing suit in federal district courts either had to find an ancient state or local law which had once mandated segregation and then demonstrate that the dual system had not been dismantled, or collect detailed school by school information on intentional segregation by school authorities.

Von Euler (1977) presents a list of such school violations: choosing the site and size of new schools for racially discriminatory purposes or

with full knowledge that the action will result in one-race schools, channeling students into segregated classrooms within schools, using mobile classrooms to increase racial isolation, busing entire classes of minority children intact to white schools and teaching them separately for an entire semester or more, manipulating transfer policies, optional zones, and feeder patterns to keep the races apart, and employing transportation for discriminatory purposes. In addition, discriminatory teacher hiring and assignment, segregatory tracking and unequal resource allocation have been found to be violations.

I believe von Euler errs in calling the detection of such violations social science. Most of it is not. Social science does not encompass all studies that seek to understand the causes of social phenomena, as she argues. It includes only those studies that seek to analyze the causes of social phenomena by scientific methods which can rule out competing hypotheses in an objective manner. That is not the case with most of the violation fact collecting that occurs in northern cases. A detective is not a social scientist.

Keyes v. School District No. 1 (1973) was the first northern de jure segregation case the Supreme Court was willing to hear. Like the southern cases where metropolitan merger was sought, the plaintiffs collected school by school violations data of the sort described above. Because intentional discrimination was proven in a "significant" portion of the Denver school district, the burden then shifted to the school board to prove they did not intentionally segregate the rest of the school system.

Although some observers thought the Supreme Court would take the opportunity in Keyes to resolve the rather arbitrary distinction between de facto and de jure segregation by finding de facto segregation unconstitutional,

it did not. It simply stretched the definition of de jure segregation so that it encompasses almost every action a school board might take which results in racially imbalanced schools, and every instance where they failed to desegregate. Unless one can demonstrate that school authorities are responsible for residential segregation (which has never been done), the courts are distorting the normal meaning of the law when they conclude that because school personnel failed to desegregate this or that school, they segregated it. This is analagous to convicting a person of first degree murder because they failed to come to the aid of an injured person who subsequently died.

Many legal scholars argue that the result of this convoluted logic is a growing disrespect for the law (Yudof, 1978; Fiss, 1975). Two solutions to this problem come to mind. The first, which I favor, is that the courts should drop their pretense and declare de facto segregation unconstitutional. If school segregation is harmful, it should be harmful whether it is directly caused by school authorities or indirectly by housing discrimination practiced by individuals and other governmental bodies. One possible reason why the courts have not done this is that it would mean a greater or more explicit reliance on social science evidence of the harm of segregation. As long as the research is as complex and divergent as it is, the courts will find it less distasteful to distort the law. The second solution is that the courts should simply stop redefining de facto segregation as de jure segregation. Such logical consistency would drastically curtail northern school desegregation, however, since these school districts are usually convicted on very little truly de jure evidence.

Wolf's (1976) analysis of the Detroit case Bradley v. Milliken, 1971) discusses many of these problems. The only expert witness on housing

segregation who was a social scientist in the sense I have defined above was Karl Taeuber. The weakest part of Taeuber's testimony, because it is not based on any empirical data analysis, is his discussion of the relationship between housing and school segregation. He describes three ways in which school attendance zones may affect patterns of residence. First, residential neighborhoods rarely have precisely defined boundaries and schools provide local administrative boundaries which are widely known and which determine choice of residence. Second, those with young school age children are the most mobile families and most likely to be influenced by the racial composition of the neighborhood. Third, schools, their staffs, and attendance zones, are subject to direct administrative control and observed changes are highly visible because of it and hence very influential. Finally, he concludes that at one time (after World War I) the black population in Detroit was so small that there were no all black neighborhoods nor all black schools. The patterns of residential segregation and school segregation evolved together. Either pattern, without the other, would have been much more difficult to foster and sustain.

These are interpretive judgements -- the conclusions of a sociologist, not a social scientist. Moreover, I am not sure these point to an indictment of the school board, which was after all the defendant.

While Taeuber argues convincingly for the importance of school segregation

in influencing residential segregation, he does not demonstrate that the school board was guilty of anything other than failing to desegregate their schools as they became segregated by neighborhood patterns.

Wolf (1976) and Wisdom (1975) believe Judge Roth was greatly influenced by the social science research and expert testimony in the Detroit case because he went through a significant metamorphis during the course of the trial. Wolf characterizes him as a conservative who had only recently ruled against an extremely limited mandatory plan in favor of a voluntary effort. Later during the hearings he was presented with a social science consensus, not only on housing segregation and its causes, but on the educational consequences of desegregation. He was told that race and class integration had positive effects upon minority academic achievement, self-concept, motivation, aspirations, racial attitudes, and race relations. After hearing this, he ordered a panel to prepare the most extensive desegregation plan in history. The Detroit city school system was to be merged (for the purposes of school assignment) with 53 suburban school districts dispersing 780,000 students of all ages over the metropolitan area. Despite the apparent influence of the social science testimony, the court's opinion cited only the evidence on constitutional violations within the school system. Karl Taeuber's unacknowledged influence is evident, however, in the Court's discussion of housing segregation and its relationship to school segregation.

Wolf (1976) contends the school board did not adequately defend itself during the trial because of their liberal or pro-integration inclinations. Moreover, they presented a desegregation plan to the Court that was far more extensive than the one finally adopted. Thus, it was left to the suburban school districts to

introduce evidence against busing during the remedy hearings through the testimony of David Armor. Although Armor has done only one study on the subject, a case study of the METCO voluntary city-suburban desegregation program, he is often cited by judges (e.g. Wisdom, 1975: 144) and legislators as the author of several studies of the effects of mandatory desegregation or forced "busing". In fact, if his case study shows anything it is the negative effects of voluntary desegregation where small, isolated numbers of inner city blacks attend virtually all white, high income, suburban schools with no special preparation on the part of the schools.

Judge Roth allowed the suburban school boards to take Armor's statement, but later refused to admit it into evidence on the grounds that it was irrelevant, and represented "a new rationale for a return to the discredited 'separate but equal' policy" (345 F. Supp. at 921). Indeed, Roth excluded all evidence questioning the value of metropolitan or cross district desegregation. This was criticized by Judge Weick in the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals (which upheld the district court's decision). He argued in his dissent, as other lawmakers had done earlier, that sociological opinions and evidence should be admitted because the Supreme Court had rested its decision in Brown on sociological data. Thus the sociological interpretation of Brown still had supporters among the legal profession.

The Supreme Court reversed the appellate court and hence the district court on the grounds that the evidence did not justify a metropolitan plan. Yudof (1978) finds the Supreme Court's holding that the scope of

the remedy should not exceed the scope of the violation to be in direct contradiction to earlier decisions (e.g. Swann) in which no attempt was made to adhere to this principle. He is wrong. It is consistent with all of their previous rulings in metropolitan cases involving independent city and suburban school districts. The unspoken principle seems to be this: the scope of the remedy may exceed the scope of the violation, but it may not extend past the boundaries of previously independent political entities unless some evidence, often trivial, of collusion to intentionally segregate the city school system and the affected suburban school systems is found. Once this is found, the scope of the remedy can exceed the violation but again it may not extend past the boundaries of the districts where collusion was found.

Three years later, in 1977, the Supreme Court remanded the Dayton case (1977) to the district court because there was insufficient evidence of a violation as great as the remedy ordered. This was followed two days later by their remanding of the Omaha and Milwaukee school desegregation cases for reconsideration. In each instance, the Supreme Court asked the lower courts to determine the degree of school segregation attributable to school district actions. David Armor was then commissioned by the school boards to conduct studies of the incremental effects of segregatory acts committed by the school systems (United States of America and Webb v. the School District of Omaha, 1978; Armstrong v. O'Connell, 1979). In these cases, Armor calculated yearly segregation indices (using the index of dissimilarity[2] and the relative exposure index)[3] from a starting point prior to court cited violations up until the present time. These actual segregation indices were then compared to hypothetical segregation

indices without court cited violations (open enrollment transfers, boundary changes, and feeder patterns), calculated after all students were returned to their pre-violation home school.

The most unsatisfactory part of the analysis is the estimation of the effects of new school openings if the school had been opened elsewhere, and the effect of school closings if the students had been reassigned elsewhere. The degree of personal judgement which enters into this is enormous and substantially reduces the reliability of the analysis.

The most criticized aspect of the analysis is that it does not directly measure the extent of segregation which results when individuals refuse to move into a particular attendance zone because of the segregative actions of the school district, or when they move out of such neighborhoods because of school district segregative actions. In other words, it assumes a unidirectional relationship between housing and school segregation with no evidence that this is indeed the case and in the face of demographers' statements that it is not.

Nevertheless, both Armor's analysis and Karl Taeuber's opposing testimony served a useful function in this court case and in the development of school desegregation law. The social scientists directed the Court's attention to the issues that needed to be analyzed and to the feasibility of determining how much of present school segregation is a result of the past intentional segregative acts of the school system. The Milwaukee court decision is one of the few which openly acknowledges the influence of the social science research, even going so far as to admit (463 F. Supp. at 1301-1302) that in the "battle of the experts" it had been forced into the role of

evaluating almost entirely contradictory sociological and urban geography theories, and in so doing had had to rely on the qualifications and the persuasiveness of the expert witnesses in reaching its own conclusions on the ultimate issue of present segregatory effects.

In reading the Court's criticisms of Armor's method, the unacknowledged influence of the plaintiffs' expert, Karl Taeuber, is apparent. The opinion argues that no court in any school case will ever be able to say with any assurance where people would have been located or how much integration would have been obtained without officially imposed discrimination. Furthermore, the Court specifically noted three defects in Armor's analysis. First, his analysis failed to take into account that the individual violations set forth in the June 1, 1978 decision were not the only violations which the Court found to have occurred: there were also systemwide violations. Second, Armor's analysis assumed that had the individual intentionally discriminatory acts not occurred, no other neutral or nondiscriminatory action would have been taken. Third, his analysis ignored the possible psychological and attitudinal effects of the acts. Finally, his analysis failed to take into account that a single act of discrimination may have an effect beyond that felt by the persons, or in the schools or districts of immediate impact. The Court also noted (at 1304) criticisms of Armor's work in two earlier court decisions, United States v. Board of School Commissioners of the City of Indianapolis, Indiana (1974) at 85 and Northcross v. Board of Education of Memphis (1972) at 890 and 894.

The issue of whether one can determine incremental segregative effects by simply analyzing the level of segregation with and without the violation was raised again in the Columbus and Dayton Supreme Court decisions when the first Social Science Statement since Brown was attached as an

appendix to the respondents (original plaintiffs) brief to the Supreme Court. Titled "School Segregation and Residential Segregation: A Social Science Statement", it was signed by 38 "experts" many of whom are not social scientists.[4] The major focus of the statement was the relationship between school segregation and residential segregation. (It also included a brief summary of what is known about how to achieve positive academic achievement and race relations outcomes in a desegregated school.) The basic argument made was that school segregation and racially discriminatory pupil assignment and open transfer policies promote racially identifiable neighborhoods which then contributes to further school segregation.

The statement noted that it was not possible, given the state of social science research and the available data to measure this reciprocal relationship, thus implying that research such as Armor's which assumes the relationship is one-way is simplistic and misleading. Of course, this criticism cuts both ways. If the social science research cannot measure this reciprocal relationship, how do we know it exists?

Negative Research Findings and the Effect on Remedies: 1970-1975

Many legal observers (Yudof, 1978; Taylor, 1978) feel that the 1974 Milliken decision marked the beginning of a period of retreat from the universalistic ethic. In contrast to Yudof, Taylor believes that the Court has not repudiated directly or by implication any doctrine that it had adopted before 1973 to define constitutional violations or determine remedies. Rather, Taylor argues, the majority has exhibited a reluctance to extend previously announced legal principles to claims for new remedies and has used various braking devices, such as the requirement that lower court judges make more careful and detailed findings (e.g. Dayton, 1977, and

Austin, 1976), to slow the pace of desegregation. The latter is not the same thing as repudiation since it allows the Court the option of accelerating desegregation without seeming to be entirely inconsistent.

One can speculate on why there appears to be this retreat from the universalistic ethic. One plausible explanation is that the contradictory findings of social science research studies on the effect of school desegregation on black children's achievement, self-esteem, motivation, life chances, and inter-racial contact with whites, along with new research findings on the acceleration of white flight by school desegregation, have influenced the judiciary's decisions. Even if such evidence is not introduced into a court case, judges are citizens and they undoubtedly read social commentary on the research findings and are aware of the controversy. In order to find districts guilty on the weak evidence usually produced, and to order sweeping remedies extending the scope of previous decisions, it seems to me that one would have to believe in the essential benefit of the remedy. As the benefit of the remedy is called into question by experts and social commentators in the field, we might expect the courts to exercise caution in their decisions.

Many students of school desegregation research would argue, however, that the findings of social science research are not as uncertain and inconclusive as such social scientists as Wolf (1972, 1976), St. John (1975), and Armor (1972) would have us believe, and as many legal scholars (Yudof, 1973, 1978; Goodman, 1972) and judges seem to believe. It does not seem unwarranted to conclude that if social scientists such as Slavin (1977, 1979), Cohen, et al. (1976) and DeVries, et al. (1974) can obtain significant, sometimes spectacular, results in laboratory and field experiments, it

is not the principle itself which is faulty, but its application. The appearance of inconsistency in desegregation effects is due, in part, to the failure of most researchers to delineate the contextual environmental variables in their outcome analyses. But to conclude that the principle of school desegregation is defective, as many have done,
that black students will have similar or higher achievement, self-esteem, racial attitudes, motivation, etc. if they remain segregated -- is to confuse problems of implementation with problems of theory.

Federal courts have not been preoccupied with implementing school desegregation in a manner consistent with the findings of the experimental research. Indeed, the thousands of educational administrators who have testified in school desegregation cases in the last two decades probably fall into one of two categories: those that are not even aware of the research, and those that are aware of it but either do not know how to translate it into policy or do not care. As for the social scientists, few are willing to make anything other than broad, and often exaggerated, claims in support of or in opposition to school desegregation with vague references to in-service training. Almost none mention specifics regarding the kind of training and the kind of organizational/classroom changes which are necessary.

In the last four years, school desegregation court cases have been characterized by a reversal of the traditional roles of defendant and plaintiff. The plaintiffs are now on the defensive and the defendants are on the offensive. The issue which is probably most responsible for this is white flight from school desegregation. Certainly, the secular trend of white enrollment decline is an important consideration for any educational planner regardless of its cause.

Although the courts have rather consistently held that the threat of white flight should not be used as a "smokescreen" to avoid the constitutional duty to eliminate segregation, numerous courts have done exactly that (see Levin, 1978). White flight has become one of the most important issues in northern school desegregation cases since James S. Coleman's 1975 presentation at the American Educational Research Association meeting. It is also an issue on which typically only social scientists testify, usually those who have conducted their own study. The media publicity on this issue has been extraordinary, particularly because of severe criticism directed at the Coleman study by other social scientists, as well as civil rights activists. (See Rossell, 1975, 1978b, 1978c; Ravitch, 1978; Reinhold, 1975).

The statistical critiques on both sides of this debate have been characterized to a great extent by the exaggeration of both the importance of small and ultimately insignificant flaws in opposing research, as well as the exaggeration of the scientific perfection of one's own research. This has occurred both in and out of the legal arena. What is most important because of its implications for the validity of social science criticism is that one of the most widely criticized findings -- that school desegregation accelerates white enrollment decline in the year of the implementation of a plan -- is now one of the more consistent relationships observed in aggregate data. The research indicates that any school district which implements a city-wide, two-way reassignment plan can expect, in the year of implementation, at least a doubling of the normal loss rate. Under certain conditions, this implementation year loss could be as great as a four-fold increase.

The analytical problem facing the social scientist is how to isolate the policy impact from the long term suburbanization and declining birth rate trends which have caused white enrollment declines nationwide since 1968. Although most social scientists understand this, our methods for isolating policy impact from secular trends are not so developed that even a well designed study is impervious to criticism.

Three social scientists have consistently presented analyses of school desegregation and white flight in court cases: James Coleman, myself and David Armor. Armor has been assisted from time to time by Michael Ross of Boston University. In the San Diego case, Carlin v. Dan Diego Unified School District (1977) both Armor and myself compared San Diego to a sub-sample of school districts from our larger sample.

I compared San Diego to a small number of southwestern school districts with the same proportion minority, the same predesegregation percentage white enrollment decline, and extensive desegregation plans involving white reassignments. The implementation year loss predicted by my sub-sample analysis was a little more than a doubling of San Diego's percentage white enrollment decline, a prediction fully consistent with Coleman's (1975b) prediction equations.

Armor, on the other hand, chose nine northern court ordered school districts with 2¼ times San Diego's predesegregation percentage white enrollment decline. This made for the largest predicted white flight in the history of the United States (a six-fold increase in the predesegregation trend) in a school district which was only 14 percent black and another 12 percent Hispanic.

Because the Judge had no knowledge of social science research on this

subject, he did not understand that the bulk of the research was with a prediction of a two-fold increase. His common sense told him that the truth must lie somewhere between the two predictions. Herein lies the difficulty in presenting social science research to a court. The Court has no idea whether two arguments are equal or where the weight of research falls. Common sense may tell you that school desegregation causes at least some white flight, but it is of little use in predicting how much white flight will be produced by a given school desegregation plan in a given school district. While it may seem reasonable to average two predictions, it is as likely to be as wrong as choosing one.

After the initial hearing in the San Diego case, Armor adopted a new method of analysis which bears little resemblance to the first. In each of 23 northern and southern school districts (chosen because they had the greatest potential for extensive white flight), he determines a school age cohort retention rate for births to estimate the "normal" white enrollment loss rate. This method is similar to that used by many school districts to project kindergarten or first grade enrollments. There are numerous problems with this method which are discussed elsewhere (Rossell, 1978b). What is most interesting is how few laymen understand the limitations of even relatively simple statistical analyses such as this.

For example, few judges and lawyers have been able to grasp that Armor's demographic projection method cannot predict a school district's future enrollment with desegregation. Since the projections are from predesegregation birth rates, only the normal white enrollment loss can be predicted for the future. Yet, Armor forecasts the white enrollment loss with

extensive mandatory desegregation for every case in which he testifies. Because he is rather vague about his method, every judge and lawyer I have discussed this with has believed it came from the white birth and cohort retention rate analysis of their own city. Even after repeated and belabored explanations, few lawyers and probably fewer judges understand that it could not have been derived by this method.

Yet, the possibility of their understanding the competing methodology, cross-sectional multiple regression analysis using a quasi-experimental design, is at least as remote. Nor is it even possible at this point in time to say absolutely whether the competing methodology and its divergent finding gives us a more accurate prediction of the long term trend with school desegregation, since we can only test the model's validity on what has happened.

The white flight research is very important for the San Diego (Carlin v. San Diego) and Los Angeles (Crawford v. Los Angeles) cases because the California Supreme Court held in the Crawford decision (1976) that a school district may leave some schools segregated if there is a danger of white flight, the distance is too great, or there is some other problem.

There is, however, no guideline as to what constitutes prohibatory white flight. In the second phase of the San Diego case (1979), I attempted to calculate benefit/cost ratios for various alternative plans by solving equations generated by my 113 school district study (Rossell, 1978a). The benefit was the increase in racial balance and the proportion white in the average black child's school (the absolute measure of interracial exposure)[5] and the cost was the additional white enrollment loss (above the

normal decline). These data indicated the most extensive plan had the greatest cost, but also the greatest net benefit. Again, these predictions are similar to those generated by Coleman, et al. (1975).

Assuming the Court's goal was the greatest amount of interracial exposure (net benefit), the most rational choice would be the most extensive plan. Instead, it chose the least extensive plan although the defendant's expert, David Armor, did not contradict or refute these b/c ratios. There can be only two reasons for selection of the least rational choice. The San Diego Court does not have the goal of maximizing desegregation or Judge Welsh simply has so little faith in social science predictions of benefits and costs, that he believes it prudent to choose the alternative with the intuitively obvious least costs: no additional desegregation.

Evidence for the second interpretation (although I do not rule out the first) can be seen in Judge Welsh's response to Karl Taeuber's testimony. After spending much time demonstrating the different outcomes which could be obtained from Armor's analysis of Seattle, Washington's school desegregation plan (entered as evidence) depending on whether one analyzed the full set of data or the last few years before desegregation, the Court responded as follows (Reporter's transcript, July 2, 1979):

> THE COURT: I don't really know why we waste the Court's time with this. I'm not addressing myself to you, Dr. Taeuber. Back in 1977 in my opinion, I wrote -- in fact I said the obvious which is that White Flight is or any of the statistics is more or less depending upon how you figure it; and this is why I was somewhat intolerant at the outset to have a number of experts. I've listened to experts for 32 years on various subjects. Now, I just don't know. It just seems like an awful waste of time to me, really. Do you have any other evidence to bring out from Dr. Taeuber? (Transcript, p. 34-35)
>
> PLAINTIFFS' ATTORNEY: Other evidence than what?

> THE COURT: Other than to show that his expertise and everybody else's expertise is worthless. That you can make figures do what you want with them. I mean, we all know that, don't we? It's just that it's painful. Really, you should try to sometimes change places with me. (Transcript, p. 35)

The Plaintiffs' then argued that since the Court had no faith in social science testimony, the testimony of the defendant's expert, David Armor, should be striken. The Court responded:

> THE COURT: ... You all know how I feel about this. I don't think you need to have an expert to tell me that experts are not to be taken at face value. If you want to put in some contrary evidence, you may do so. I will not strike the evidence of Dr. Armor. I know that these things -- I don't like to use the work "contrived" because it sounds as though it's malicious: but we rationalize, calling it a science when it isn't... You know, years ago we used to decide things on the basis of our gut reactions; and somehow or other we got the idea that that was naughty and that we should be more rational. So, I don't know how many billions of dollars a year are spent in this nation and probably every other nation on the education, training, and employment of people who spend their lives rationalizing gut feelings on the basis of statistics. (Transcript, p. 36)

Thus the outcome of Taeuber's attempt to delineate the problems inherent in social science predictions and to point out the possible biases in Armor's research was to reinforce this judge's already significant skepticism rather than to diffuse it. Yudof (1978: 73) personifies this skepticism when he writes "desegregation research is characterized by dissensus, inconclusiveness, indeterminacy, and subjectivity... Under such circumstances, the claims of social science to legitimacy are no more compelling than the claims of law."

Thus a not uncommon legal reaction to the divergent social science research on school desegregation effects is that social science is not a science. Yet the benefit/cost analyses presented the San Diego Court were scientifically derived and made, I believe, an important contribution to the legal discussion. If Judge Welsh read my analysis, his thinking about the issue should have

been clearer even if he did not trust the statistical predictions.

The rejection of the social sciences as a science is inspired by two handicaps we have that physical scientists, whose methods we have borrowed and to whom we are unfavorably compared, do not have. First, the phenomena we are studying are so complex that our methods would have to be many times more advanced than those used in the physical sciences in order to yield the same reliability in findings. Second, we are dealing with a phenomena that people do have "gut reactions" about and of which they have formed folk theories. Although biomedical research continually yields conflicting findings (which are even reported in the newspapers), I have never heard anyone say that biology is not a science. This is because the average layman has no gut reaction to most biomedical findings, nor a competing "folk theory." For example, few of us have a "common sense" theory about the causes of cancer and hence the contradictory findings in biomedical research over these causes do not discredit biology as a science. Few of us have a common sense theory about "black holes" and hence the continual disagreement over their existence, their nature, and origin does not discredit physics as a science. We <u>do</u> have "gut reactions" and competing folk theories of social phenomena, and so in the face of contradictory findings are eager to denounce all and fall back on our feelings.

In spite of these handicaps, social science research on school desegregation effects <u>has</u> influenced the decisions of judges and the development of school desegregation law. Judges resist this notion. They often fail to acknowledge the source of their causal statements, and sometimes openly repudiate social science research. Most would begrudgingly admit only that they spend a good deal of their time considering and deciding school desegregation remedy issues which have been created by social science research.

CONCLUSIONS

This article has reviewed the use of social science research and expert testimony in school desegregation court cases. The extensive use of social science evidence has been motivated by two factors. First, educational equity law is a new and developing area. At least at the outset, the courts have had little precedent or legislative history to guide them in their rulings. Under such circumstances, they are vulnerable to extra-legal evidence which might help them decide what the law is. Furthermore, since this law purports to be an instrument of social change, the courts invite evidence on whether their decisions will in fact accomplish their goals. Social science research can provide such evidence.

Over time, the continual use of social science testimony in school desegregation cases has created the expectation among lawyers that, as a matter of course, it will be used to resolve legal issues. Even when there is no social science evidence to buttress a particular claim, most lawyers will find an expert willing to lend an authoritative air to their case or criticize the scientific evidence being presented by the opposing side. Thus, social science evidence and expert testimony account for a substantial portion of the trial time in school desegregation cases.

The sophistication of the social science research introduced in these cases varies enormously, as do the qualifications of the experts testifying. In general, few social scientists actually testify in school desegregation cases. The bulk of expert testimony is contributed by educators or other practitioners who draw conclusions and make inferences on the basis of opinion, personal observation, hearsay, and what they believe to be a professional census. Unfortunately, few judges make

a distinction between this kind of testimony and the testimony of social scientists as to the findings of their research. This may contribute to some confusion over the role of social science in court cases.

The school segregation cases have utilized an extensive amount of relatively sophisticated research. In determining a violation, findings from experimental and quasi-experimental research were introduced into the early cases to determine the inherent equality of the races, and the harm of segregation. In later cases, multiple regression analysis was used to determine the causes of segregation in housing and schools. Findings from experimental, quasi-experimental and cross-sectional multiple regression analysis on the effects of various remedies on student achievement, race relations, self-esteem, motivation, and life chances have been used to argue for one remedy over another. In addition, various time series analyses (pooled cross-sectional analysis, interrupted time series, trend analysis, demographic projections, etc.) have been used to demonstrate that one remedy will produce more white flight or less interracial contact than another remedy.

Although few legal scholars or judges will agree, I believe that social science research has influenced the development of educational equity law, and the outcome of educational equity cases in which it has been presented. It has done so by identifying and clarifying the important issues in the resolution of social equity disputes, by providing a certain amount of consensual, "factual" information (i.e., agreed upon by both sides) to the Court, and by instructing the Court on how to analyze these issues. Legal decisions rarely acknowledge the influence of the social science testimony, in part because in the face of their own ignorance of social science methods, most judges are reluctant to openly admit they chose one social science claim over

another. In some cases, the judge may have simply internalized the social science research presented in the case and come to believe that the knowledge he or she now has about a particular educational equity problem is "common sense". Nevertheless, the causal statements asserted in school desegregation legal opinions often indicate the Court has, consciously or unconsciously, adopted the mode of reasoning of social science and the findings which would follow from that. In effect, while they seldom acknowledge the source for their causal statements, it often appears they have chosen one social science claim over another.

Finally, I would argue that even when the social science research or expert testimony simply corroborates a judge's priori preference, as many legal scholars argue, such evidence can still critically influence a decision. In some cases social science may provide the Court with the necessary intellectual justification for a decision which cannot be made if justified solely on legal grounds.

I am indebted to John Leubsdorf, Eleanor Wolf, Ronald Anson, and Mary von Euler for careful reviews and comments on earlier drafts of this paper. This paper is a part of a longer review of educational equity cases to be published in the Review of Education, 8, 1980.

FOOTNOTES

[1]The statement was signed by the following 32 sociologists, anthropologists, psychologists, and psychiatrists who have worked in the field of race relations: Floyd H. Allport, Gordon W. Allport, Charlotte Babcock, Viola W. Bernard, Jerome S. Bruner, Hadley Cantril, Isidor Chein, Kenneth B. Clark, Mamie P. Clark, Stuart W. Cook, Bingham Dai, Allison Davis, Else Frenkel-Brunswik, Noel P. Gist, Daniel Katz, Otto Klineberg, David Krech, Alfred McClung Lee, R. M. MacIver, Robert K. Merton, Gardner Murphy, Theodore M. Newcomb, Robert Redfield, Ira DeA. Reid, Arnold M. Rose, Gerhart Saenger, R. Nevitt Sanford, S. Stanfield Sargent, M. Brewster Smith, Samuel A. Stouffer, Wellman Warner, and Robin M. Williams. Reprinted in the Minnesota Law Review, 1953, 37, Pp. 427-439.

[2]The index of dissimilarity is used to measure the extent of residential or school segregation. This measure takes as its standard the racial composition of the larger unit being studied (e.g. a school district or a city), and then compares the racial composition of the individual school or city block to the racial composition of the whole school district or city. In each city block (i) suppose there are w_i whites and n_i blacks (or any other two groups such as WASPs versus first or second generation white ethnics). The entire city contains W whites and N blacks. The index of disimilarity is calculated as follows:

$$D = 1/2 \sum_{i=1} \left| \frac{Wi}{W} - \frac{Ni}{N} \right|$$

The higher the score, the more segregated the city. A score of 100 means perfect segregation, or 100 percent of the blacks have to be reassigned in order to have perfect racial balance -- the same proportion in each block as in the whole city. A score of 0 means perfect integration. (See Taeuber and Taeuber, 1965: 236-238).

[3]The relative level of interracial exposure measures the degree to which segregation between schools is responsible for the proportion black in the average white child's school or the proportion white in the average black child's school. In each school (k) there are n_w whites and p_b blacks where n is the number and p is the proportion. In the entire school district there are P_b blacks where P is the proportion. This measure can be calculated as follows:

$$r = \frac{P_b - \frac{\sum_k n_{kw} p_{kb}}{\sum_k n_{kw}}}{P_b}$$

[4]The signers of the statement are Andrew Billingsley, James Blackwell, Ernst Borinski, Everett Cataldo, Kenneth Clark, Paul Courant, Robert Crain, Robert Dentler, G. Franklin Edwards, Edgar Epps. Reynolds Farley, Joe Feagin, John Hope Franklin, Eli Ginzburg, Robert Green, Charles Grigg, Amos Hawley, Joyce Ladner, James Loewen, Cora Marrett, James McPartland, Dorothy Newman, Gary Orfield, Diana Pearce, Thomas Pettigrew, Ray Rist, Christine Rossell, Juliet Saltman, Julian Samora, M. Brewster Smith, Michael Stolee, Garth Taylor, Karl Taeuber, Phyllis Wallace, Robert Weaver, Robin Williams, Franklin Wilson, Milton Yinger. It is dated March 21, 1979.

[5]Each school (k) has nb blacks and pw whites where n is the number and p is the proportion. This measure includes or reflects white flight in its measure of the proportion white in the average black child's school. It is thus a measure of net benefit. It is calculated as follows:

$$S_{bw} = \frac{\sum_k n_{kb} P_{kw}}{\sum_k n_{kb}}$$

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Academic References

Allport, F. H., and 31 others. The effects of segregation and the consequences of desegregation: a social science statement. Appendix to Plaintiffs' Brief, Brown v. Board of Education, 347 U. S. 483 (1954). Reprinted in Minnesota Law Review, 1953, 37, 427-439.

Armour, D. J. The evidence on busing. The Public Interest, 1972, 28, 90-126.

Billingsley, A. and 37 others. School segregation and residential segregation: a social science statement. Appendix to Brief for Respondents, Columbus Board of Education v. Gary L. Penick, in the Supreme Court of the United States, October term, 1978, No. 78-610. Reprinted in Society, 1979, 16, 70-76.

Blakeslee, J. The social scientist as expert witness. Focus, 1979, 3, 1-2. 6-7.

Cahn, E. Jurisprudence. New York University Law Review, 1955, 150, 157-168.

Caldwell, C. Social science as ammunition. Psychology Today, 1970, 4, 38-41.

Carter, D. G. Social science research: a chronology for judicial and legislative action. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, April 1977.

Clark, K. B. and Clark, M. K. The development of consciousness of self and the emergence of racial identification in Negro preschool children. Journal of Social Psychology, 1939, 10, 591-599.

Clark, K.B. Effect of prejudice and discrimination on personality development. Fact Finding Report, Mid-century White House Conference on Children and Youth, Children's Bureau, Federal Security Agency, 1950.

Clark, K. B. Racial identification and preference in Negro children. In T. H. Newcomb and E. L. Hartley (Eds.), Readings in social psychology. New York: Holt, 1952. Pp. 551-560.

Clark, K. B. The social scientist as an expert witness in civil rights litigation. Social Problems, 1953, 1, 5-10.

Clark, K. B. The desegregation case: criticism of the social scientists' role, Villanova Law Review, 1959, 5, 224-240.

Clark, K. B. Social science, constitutional rights, and the courts. Educational Forum, 1977, 41, 282-285.

Cohen, E., Lockheed, M. and Lohman, M. The center for interracial cooperation; a field experiment. Sociology of Education, 1976, 49, 47-58.

Coleman, J. S.,Campbell, E. Q., Hobson, C. J., McPartland, J., Mood, A. M., Weinfeld, F. D., and York, R. L. Equality of educational opportunity. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1965.

Coleman, J. S., Kelly, S. D., and Moore, J.A. Trends in school segregation, 1968-73. Urban Institute Working Paper, 722-03-01, 1975.

Coleman, J. S., Kelly, S. D., and Moore, J. A. Recent trends in school integregation. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, April 1975.

Crain, R. L., and Mahard, R. E. Desegregation and black achievement. Law and Contemporary Problems, 1978, 42, 17-56.

Craven, J. B. The impact of social science evidence on the judge: a personal comment. Law and Contemporary Problems, 1975, 39, 150-156.

Deutsch, M., and Brown, B., Social influences in negro-white intelligence differences. Journal of Social Issues, 1964, 20, 24-35.

Deutscher, M., and Chein, I. The psychological effects of enforced segregation: a survey of social science opinion. Journal of Psychology, 1948, 26, 259-287.

DeVries, D. L., Edwards, K. J., and Wells E. H. Teams - games tournament in the social studies classroom: effects on academic achievement, student attitudes, cognitive beliefs, and classroom climate. Technical Report 173, The Johns Hopkins University Center for Social Organization of Schools, 1974.

Doyle, W. E. Social science evidence in court cases. In R. C. Rist and R. J. Anson (Eds.), Education, social science, and the judicial process. New York: Teachers College Press, 1977. Pp. 10-19.

Duncan, O. D., Schuman, H., and Duncan, B. Social change in a metropolitan community. New York: Russell Sage, 1973.

Dworkin, R. Social sciences and constitutional rights -- the consequences of uncertainty. In R. C. Rist and R. J. Anson (Eds.), Education, social science, and the judicial process. New York: Teachers College Press, 1977. Pp. 20-31.

Eels, K. Intelligence and cultural differences. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969.

Engelmann, S. The effectiveness of direct instruction on IQ performance and achievement in reading and arithmetic. In Hellmuth, J. (Ed.), Disadvantaged child. New York: Brunner/Mazel, 1970.

Farley, R. Racial integration in the public schools, 1967 to 1972: assessing the effects of governmental policies. Sociological Focus, 1975, 8, 3-26.

Farley, R., Schuman, H., Bianchi, S., Colasanto, D., Hatchett, S. Chocolate city, vanilla suburbs: will the trend toward racially separate communities continue? Social Science Research, 1978, 7, 319-344.

Farley, R., Richards, T., and Wurdock, C. School desegregation and white flight: an investigation of competing models and their discrepant findings. Unpublished paper, Ann Arbor, the University of Michigan, 1979.

Fauman, S. J., and Sharp, H. Presenting the results of social research to the public. Public Opinion Quarterly, 1958, 22, 107-115.

Fiss, O. M. The jurisprudence of busing. Law and Contemporary Problems, 1975, 39, 194-216.

Friedman, L. The legal system. New York: Russell Sage, 1975.

Glazer, N. L. Is busing necessary? Commentary, 1972, 53, 39-52.

Goodman, F. I. De facto school segregation: a constitutional and empirical analysis. California Law Review, 1972, 60, 274-437.

Greeley, A. Debunking the role of social scientists in court. Human Rights, 1978, 7, 34-36.

Greenberg, J. Social scientists take the stand: a review and appraisal of their testimony in litigation. Michigan Law Review, 1956, 54, 953-969.

Gregor, J. A. The law, social science, and school segregation: an assessment. Case Western Law Review, 1963, 14, 621-636.

Hazard, G. C. Jr. Limitations on the uses of behavioral science in the law. Case Western Law Review, 1967, 19, 71-77.

Jencks,C., Smith, M., Acland, H., Bane, M. J., Cohen, D., Gintis, H., Heyns, B., and Michelson, S. Inequality. New York: Basic Books, 1972.

Kalmuss, D. Social scientists in the judicial arena: role-related issues and conflicts. A dissertation prospectus to the University of Michigan Sociology Department, September 1978.

Kantrowitz, N. School segregation, residential segregation: some speculation. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Sociological Association, New York, 1976.

Katz, M. The unmasking of dishonest pretensions: toward an interpretation of the role of social science in constitutional litigation. American Sociologist, 1971, 6, 54-58.

Katz, P. The acquisition of racial attitudes in children. In P. Katz (Ed.), Towards the elimination of racism. New York: Pergamon, 1976. Pp. 125-157.

Killian, L. W. The social scientist's role in the preparation of the Florida desegregation brief. Social Problems, 1956, 3, 211-214.

Kluger, R. Simple justice. New York: Knopf, 1975.

Kohn, J. Social psychological data, legislative fact, and constitutional law. George Washington Law Review, 1960, 29, 136-165.

Leubsdorf, John. Personal communication. December 1979.

Levin, B., and Moise, P School desegregation litigation in the seventies and the u e of social science evidence: an annotated guide. Law and Contemporary Problems, 1975, 39, 50-133.

Levin, B. School desegregation remedies and the role of social science research. Law and Contemporary Problems, 1978, 42, 1-36.

McMillan, J. B. Social science and the district court: the observations of a journeyman trial judge. Law and Contemporary Problems, 1975, 39, 157-163.

Miller, S. I., and Kavanagh, J. Empirical evidence. Journal of Law and Education, 1975, 4, 159-171.

Morris, R. E. Witness performance under stress: a sociological approach. Journal of Social Issues, 1957, 13, 17-22.

Pettigrew, T. F. Sociological consulting in race relations. American Sociologist, 1971, 6, 44-47.

Pettigrew, T. Attitudes on race and housing: a social-psychological view. In A. H. Hawley, and V. P. Rock (Eds.), Segregation in Residential Areas. Washington, D. C.: National Academy of Sciences, 1973. Pp. 21-84.

Pound, R. The scope and purpose of sociological jurisprudence. Harvard Law Review, 1911, 24, 591-619.

Ravitch, D. The white flight controversy. The Public Interest, 1978, 51, 135-149.

Reinhold, R. Report of failure of busing conceded by author to exceed scientific data. New York Times, July 11, 1975.

Riessman, F. The culturally deprived child. New York: Harper, 1962.

Rist, R. C., and Anson, R. J. Social science and the judicial process in education cases. Journal of Law and Education, 1977, 6, 1-40.

Rivlin, A. Forensic social science. Harvard Educational Review, 1973, 43, 61-75.

Rose, A. The social scientist as an expert witness in court cases. In P. Lazarsfeld, W. Sewell, and H. Wilensky (Eds.), The uses of sociology. New York: Basic Books, 1967. Pp. 100-118.

Rosen, P. L. The supreme court and social science. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1972.

Rosenblum, V. G. A place for social science along the judiciary's constitutional law frontier. Northwestern University Law Review, 1971, 66, 455-480.

Rossell, C. H. School desegregation and white flight. Political Science Quarterly, 1975-76, 90, 675-695.

Rossell, C. H. Assessing the unintended impacts of public policy: school desegregation and resegregation. A report prepared for the National Institute of Education, 1978.

Rossell, C. H. White flight: pros and cons. Social Policy, 1978, 9, 46-51.

Rossell, C. H. A response to the white flight controversy. The Public Interest, 1978, 53, 109-111.

St. John, N. H. School desegregation: outcomes for children. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1975.

Sexton, P. Education and income. New York: Viking Press, 1961.

Slavin, R. E. Student team learning techniques: narrowing the achievement gap between the races. Technical Report 228, The Johns Hopkins University Center for the Social Organization of Schools, 1977.

Slavin, R. E. Effects of biracial learning teams on cross-racial friendships Journal of Educational Psychology, 1979, 71, 331-387.

Taeuber, K. E. and Taeuber, A. F. Negroes in cities. New York: Atheneum, 1965.

Taeuber, K. E. Demographic perspectives on housing and school segregation. Wayne Law Review, 1975, 21, 833-850.

Taylor, W. L. The supreme court and recent school desegregation cases: the role of social science in a period of judicial retrenchment. Law and Contemporary Problems, 1978, 42, 37-56.

U. S. Commission on Civil Rights. Racial isolation in the public schools. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Printing Office, 1967.

van den Haag, E. Social science testimony in the desegregation cases. Villanova Law Review, 1960, 6, 69-79.

von Euler, M. Meeting the courts' new research needs. Education and Urban Society, 1977, 9, 277-302.

Wasby, S. L., D'Amato, A. A., and Metrailer, R. Desegregation from Brown to Alexander. Southern Illinois University Press, 1977.

Winnick, R., and Taylor, J. Racial preference -- 36 years later. Journal of Social Psychology, 1977, 102, 157-158.

Wolf, E. P. Civil rights and social science data. Race, 1972, 14, 155-182.

Wolf, E. P. Social science and the courts: the Detroit schools case. The Public Interest, 1976, 42, 102-120.

Wolf, E. P. Courtrooms and classrooms. In R. C. Rist and R. J. Anson (Eds.), Education, social science, and the judicial process. New York: Teachers College Press, 1977. Pp. 97-124.

Wolf, E. P. Personal communication. January 9, 1980.

Wisdom, J. M. Random remarks on the role of social sciences in the judicial decision-making process in school desegregation cases. Law and Contemporary Problems, 1975, 39, 134-149.

Yudof, M. G. Equal educational opportunity and the courts. Texas Law Review, 1973, 51, 411-504.

Yudof, M. G. School desegregation: legal realism, reasoned elaboration, and social science research in the supreme court. Law and Contemporary Problems, 1978, 42, 57-110.

Court Cases

Armstrong v. O'Connell, trial testimony of David G. Armor, October 24, 1978.

Armstrong v. O'Connell, 463 F. Supp. 1295 (1979).

Austin Independent School District v. United States, 429 U. S. 990 (1976).

Bolling v. Sharpe, 347 U. S. 497 (1954).

Bradley v. Milliken, 338 F. Supp. 582 (1971); 345 F. Supp. 914 (1972); 484 F. 2d 215 (1973).

Bradley v. School Board of the City of Richmond, 338 F. Supp. 67 (1972), 462 F. 2d 1058 (1972); 412 U. S. 92 (1973).

Brewer v. School Board of the City of Norfolk, 434 F. 2d 408 (1970); 399 U. S. 929 (1970).

Briggs v. Elliott, 98 F. Supp. 529 (1951); 342 U. S. 350 (1952); 103 F. Supp. 62 (1952); 132 F. Supp. 776 (1955).

Brown v. Board of Education, 98 F. Supp. 797 (1951); 345 U. S. 972 (1953); 347 U. S. 483 (1954); Brown II: 349 U. S. 494 (1955).

Brunson v. Board of Trustees of School District No. 1 of Clarendon County, 429 F. 2d 820 (1970).

Carlin v. San Diego Unified School District, Superior Court of California, County of San Diego, No. 303800, Memorandum Decision and Order, March 9, 1977.

Carlin v. San Diego Unified School District, trial testimony of Karl Taeuber, July 2, 1979.

Carlin v. San Diego Unified School District, Superior Court of California, County of San Diego, No. 303800, Memorandum Decision, July 27, 1979.

Columbus Board of Education, et al., Petitioners v. Gary L. Penick et al., Brief for Respondents, in the Supreme Court of the United States, October Term, 1978, No. 78-610.

Crawford V. Board of Education, 17 Cal. 3d 280 (1976).

Cumming v. Richmond County Board of Education, 175 U. S. 528 (1899).

Davis v. County Board of Education of Prince Edward County, 103 F. Supp. 337 (1952).

Dayton Board of Education v. Brinkman, 433 U. S. 406 (1977).

Evers v. Jackson Municipal Separate School District, 232 F. Supp. 241 (1964); 357 F. 2d 653 (1966).

Gebhart v. Belton, 91 A. 2d 862 (Del. 1952); 91 A. 2d 137 (Del. 1953).

Gong Lum v. Rice, 275 U. S. 78 (1927).

Hobson v. Hansen, 269 F. Supp. 401 (1967); 327 F. Supp 844 (1971).

Keyes v. School District No. 1 Denver, 303 F. Supp. 279 (1969); 313 F. Supp. 61 (1970); 368 F. Supp. 207 (1973); 413 U. S. 189 (1973); 380 F. Supp. 673 (1974).

Milliken v. Bradley, 418 U. S. 717 (1974).

Morgan v. Kerrigan, 509 F. 2d 580 (1974); cert. denied, 421 U. S. 963 (1975); Phase II: 388 F. Supp. 581 (1975); 430 F. 2d 401 (1976); 540 F. 2d 527 (1976).

Muller v. Oregon, 208 U. S. 412 (1908).

Northcross v. Board of Education of Memphis, 466 F. 2d 890 (1972).

Plessy v. Ferguson, 163 U. S. 537 (1896).

Rodriguez v. San Antonio Independent School District, 337 F. Supp. 280 (1971).

Scott v. Sandford, 60 U.S. (19 How.) 393 (1856)

Shelly v. Kraemer, 68 S. Ct. 836 (1948).

Stell v. Savannah-Chatham County Board of Education, 220 F. Supp. 667 (1963).

Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education, 300 F. Supp. 1358 (1969); 402 U. S. 1 (1971).

Sweatt v. Painter, 339 U.S. 629 (1949)

United States of America v. Board of School Commissioners of the City of Indianapolis, Indiana, 503 F. 2d 68 (1974).

United States of America and Webb v. the School District of Omaha, 541 F. 2d 708 (1976); 565 F. 2d 127 (1977).

United States of America and Webb v. the School District of Omaha, trial testimony of David G. Armor, Dec. 12, 14 and 15, 1978.